



A N
A P O L O G Y
F O R T H E
C A T H O L I C S
O F
G R E A T B R I T A I N a n d I R E L A N D.



[Price Two Shillings and Six-pence.]



224 67
A N

A P O L O G Y

F O R T H E

C A T H O L I C S

O F

G R E A T B R I T A I N a n d I R E L A N D :

K Catholics of
Humbly offered to the Consideration of the

K I N G's most Excellent Majesty,

A N D

Both Houses of P A R L I A M E N T.

Try the Spirits, whether they are of God.

1 Epist. Gen. John, iv. 1.

L O N D O N :

Printed for the AUTHOR, and sold by T. PEAT,
Bookseller, at the *Temple-Exchange, Fleet-street.*

M D C C L X V I I I .



T H E
P R E F A C E.

OF late the Catholics have been so aspersed and vilified, that persons, unacquainted with their principles, might, with good reason, suspect that something is repugnant in them to all divine and human laws, and consequently that the Catholics, the abettors of them, deserve the most rigorous punishments, or should be totally suppressed and excluded society. Those who have undertaken thus to traduce them, have, no doubt, their motives for so doing; but if these motives were examined by the test of a candid disquisition, it is greatly to be feared they would appear exceeding frivolous:

lous: in some, they would be found influenced by a much larger portion of blind zeal than true knowledge; in others, by vain terrors and apprehensions; in others, by a spirit of malevolence, or view of indulging the humour of calumniating; and in others, by the perhaps iniquitous design of disturbing the peace of his Majesty's government. It may be much questioned, whether better grounded motives can be assigned; and, if not, this just inference may be drawn, that there is nothing of so pernicious a tendency in the faith of Catholics, nor any thing so base or corrupt in their morals, as to make them objects of public detestation; and if they are considered in a political light, their number is not so considerable, nor their interest so powerful, as to create any jealousy in the state. They have long enjoyed the lenity of the government, and are thankful for it; and as their intention is no other than to demean themselves as good subjects,

jects, they hope for a continuance of the same benevolent disposition.

However, as there are certain reasons for supposing them obnoxious to the present establishment in Church and State; and as there are, and may be always, restless men to stir up persecution against them, and this chiefly for the sake of serving some private end, or through a mistaken zeal; it seems highly necessary, as matters are now circumstanced, to state the case of the Catholics in the British Dominions: And, the Author of the following sheets has endeavoured to do it in so fair and impartial a manner, with so much sincerity and truth, and without the least disguise, that he flatters himself, every dispassionate Protestant, thinking seriously, and judging upon mature reflection, will entertain more favourable sentiments of the Catholics, and will have a heart averse from the treatment they have hitherto
expe-

experienced. The Author also declares, that he is far from intending the least offence against the Government, or any religious class of men, tolerated by the Law; and being sensible that animosity can be attended with few prevailing arguments in disceptations of this kind, he quite disclaims it: for he aims at nothing more than a modest Apology for the Religion he professes.

Note. All the Texts of Scripture hereafter quoted, are from the Protestant Translation of the Bible.

A N
A P O L O G Y, &c.

C H A P. I.

Of PERSECUTION in General.

These things have I spoken unto you, that ye should not be offended. They shall put you out of the synagogues: yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you, will think that he doeth God service. And these things will they do unto you, because they have not known the father nor me. But these things have I told you, that when the time shall come, ye may remember that I told you of them. And these things I said unto you at the beginning, because I was with you.

John xvi. 1, 2, 3, 4.

THESE are the words of Christ comforting his Apostles under all future Persecutions, and they seem to be particularly characteristic of the treatment they

B

were

were likely to receive from the Jews; who, regardless of Christ's doctrine and miracles, which fully proved him to be their expected Messiah, were notwithstanding so enamoured of their carnal and ceremonial law, and so elated with the confidence they placed in it, as the only acceptable worship to God, that, fired with the most indignant emotions of blind zeal, they were always ready to persecute those who reminded them of their infatuation. It was not so with such among the Jews, who were actuated with the spirit of the law: they interpreted all its sacrifices, oblations, and ceremonies, as symbols of a more perfect law, the law of Redemption and Grace; for, as they were sensible from the predictions of their prophets, that God would "send his Son in the fullness of time," so they were disposed to receive and acknowledge him when he came. Simeon "waited for the consolation of Israel," and departed in peace when he had seen salvation." *We know thou art a teacher come from God,* said Nicodemus to Christ, *for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him,* John iii. 2. Thus Christ was under no apprehensions of ill usage to his beloved disciples from those Jews, whose hearts,

hearts replete with Charity, hoped, through the Messiah, for a perfect reconciliation with God; so that, when they heard the word, “ they hardened not their hearts,” but received it with gladness, and steadfastly abided by its inspirations. His concern, therefore, pointed out the carnal Jews : These vainly imagined that the Messiah was to appear among them in the splendor and majesty of a mighty temporal prince, and that he was to go before them to fight their battles, and rescue them from the dominion of the Romans : they could not conceive that his kingdom was not of this world ; and seeing him appear in an humble state, defenceless, unprotected, and without any authority or power, than what the importance of his mission and doctrine commanded, they rejected him with contempt, put him to an ignominious death, and raised dreadful Persecutions against all his followers.

Passion and prejudice retain a very powerful ascendant over the minds of men ; it is cool reflection and sound judgment, aided by the most cogent reasons, that must dissipate the clouds they raise. Nothing in Christ’s appearance, as we have seen, could persuade the

carnal Jews that he was the promised and prefigured expectation of nations ; that as he was the end of the law, so it was fulfilled in him ; and that consequently his doctrine was to supersede it. These were *nouvel* notions to them, and strongly marked, as they supposed, with a design to impose upon their intellects. Hence, we need not wonder, if in putting Christ's disciples out of their synagogues, and even killing them, they thought they did God service. It was, as they were fully persuaded, incumbent on them to oppose all innovations ; and it must be allowed, under such a deception from appearances, that there was some shadow of reason to plead for their exerting themselves in the way they did. This, therefore, is all that can be said to extenuate the crime of Persecution in the carnal Jews ; for, as no interior conviction wrought so prevalently ; as to make them judge that their law ought to be abrogated, we cannot be much surprized to find them so tenacious of every thing belonging to it, and so vigilant in guarding against whatever might be hurtful to its preservation.

Persecution, raised upon such motives, and influenced by the notion of doing God service, may

may be styled *Religious Persecution*, in contradistinction to another sort, which I call *Political Persecution*.

The first sort of Persecution, whatever allowances the Mosaic law may indulge the Jews in, is, in the main, incompatible with Christian perfection. The evangelical precept is express against treating any one as our enemy. *Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy: but I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you, Matt. v. 43, 44.* If then the Gospel inculcates, that we should consider all mankind as our neighbours; that a friendly disposition should manifest itself in the whole conduct of our life; that fraternal charity should be, as it were, the moving force of our actions; and that universal benevolence should constantly inspire our hearts with the warmest affection for the welfare of our fellow-creatures; there will be no room left for imagining, that to chasten with the rod of Persecution, is doing God service, much less that it can be justified in his sight. Some may insinuate, that Christ

came not to send peace on the earth, but the “ sword”, and that he recommended, from the words, “ compel them to come in”, constraint. In the first place, Christ may have meant no more than the many tribulations we must suffer before we are found worthy to enter into his kingdom ; that our life on earth is a state of warfare ; and that notwithstanding the grace he gives us, when we sincerely ask it, for our sanctification, we are to be engaged in conflicts with our passions, which for our probation he has not thought proper to exempt us from. In the second place, it is impossible for a man to be a good or orthodox Christian from mere compulsion. You must correct his heart, or convince his understanding. Tortures may extort a confession from his lips, but how is his mind disposed ? Has he that has undertaken to reclaim him from error, or to make him return to the ways of righteousness, prayed that the divine illumination might rest upon his soul ? Has he behaved as St. Paul counsels Timothy : *Preach the word, be instant in season, out of season ; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long suffering and doctrine ?* Tim. iv. 2. In short, no sacrifice is agreeable to God, but that which is perfectly voluntary ; and, if we
 serve

serve him truly and unfeignedly, we must serve him with a love of choice and a love of reason. We ought therefore endeavour to recall our brother that has strayed from the sheepfold, not with reviling menaces, but with gentle persuasion: we should mildly expostulate with him on the caprice, the self-love, the pride, that have diverted him to a wrong bias: if we perceive any other source of his delusion, we are to point it out so as to make him sensible of it. Above all, the danger of the future health of his soul, by denying or perverting any truth the authority of the unerring God has revealed, is too interesting a topic not to be particularly attended to: add to this, the scandal he has given his neighbour, or the guilt he has involved him in by infecting him with the poison of his opinions. All these considerations, duly weighed, may be productive of the most salutary effects; so that the wound that could not bear the pungency of sharp medicine, promises a compleat cure by the benign qualities of lenient balsam.

Political Persecution seems to have in view, not so much the intention of doing God service, as being of service to the state. Every government

government has adopted a favourite system of religion, and wishes that all its members would indiscriminately conform to it, in order to promote the purposes of unanimity, a thing very desirable in a well policed state. Hence the civil power friendly conspires with those to whom they have delegated the ecclesiastical power, to cherish and maintain in permanency this favourite religious system. The latter are to take care that no attempt is formed which has a tendency to its abolition, either by the introduction of a new one, or by altering any material point with strange glosses and interpretations. The former, upon a report made of the delinquent's offence, with the circumstances aggravating or extenuating it, proceed to inflict on him such pains and penalties, as the laws have in such case provided.

These preliminary and general notions may be considered, as so many definitions and postulatus, which will be of service in the subsequent discussions and animadversions on Persecution in Particular, as it has been occasionally adopted by Catholics and Protestants. We shall therefore examine the mutual recriminations of both on this head.

C H A P.

C H A P. II.

Of the Charge of PERSECUTION brought against Catholics by Protestants.

THE Protestants accuse the Catholics of having recourse to Persecution in a variety of ways, which may be reduced to three capital points, viz. *actual Punishment, Intolerance, and Uncharitableness.*

In the primitive ages of the Church, it was customary with those who were placed in any degree of authority in the Church, to signify their displeasure of any immoral practice, or any doctrine contrary to the faith received, by *exhortation, commination, or excommunication.* The parties were first admonished by words of gentle persuasion, to relinquish that vicious course of life which had given so much scandal to the Faithful: or if they had published any erroneous opinions, they were earnestly entreated to retract them, that so the further spreading of the contagion might be timely prevented, and the unity of faith preserved. If they persisted, they were threatened with
 God's

God's judgments, which were supposed to await them even in this world, by some dismal calamity in their persons or fortune. If they remained deaf to all counsels, sollicitations, and threats; self-willed, obstinate, inflexible, and incorrigible; they were cut off from the communion of the Faithful, and by that act adjudged to heap coals of fire on their own heads, to draw down on them the fierce wrath of God, and, by final impenitence, that eternal enmity between God and the sinner, which must be attended with eternal punishment; for, though God is long-suffering, and his mercy knows no bounds, yet, on the prevaricator of his law, and on him who says I will not serve, his justice will be exerted in the most signal manner.

We find examples of the methods of proceeding against heretics and scandalous sinners, set by the Apostles themselves to their successors in the Church. Scarce was the door of faith opened unto the Gentiles, when certain men who came down from Judea, and certain of the sect of Pharisees who believed, had endeavoured to subvert their souls by persuading them, that they could not be saved unless

less they were circumcised, and kept the law of Moses, *Acts* xv. This doctrine, which was far from being countenanced by the Apostles, who had given no commandment about it, was condemned in the first general council held at Jerusalem. And as to scandalous sinners, we see a form of excommunication recommended by St. Paul against the incestuous Corinthian: *In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such a one unto satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus*, 1 Cor. v. 4, 5.

Whilst the sword of justice remained in the hands of the Pagans, it was not possible for the Church to punish otherwise any of her intestine enemies, than by denouncing anathema's against them; neither, when peace was restored to her, by the conversion of Constantine the Great, did she adopt any weapons offensive or defensive, but such as were purely spiritual. Not long after the reign of Constantine, the Arian heresy gaining ground, particularly in the eastern division of the Roman empire, from the countenance shewn it by the emperor

emperor Constantius, there arose sharp contests between the Orthodox and Arians. These contests, however, on the side of the true professors of christianity, did not exceed the bounds of friendly expostulations in support of the Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: for, indeed, they were the persecuted, and not the persecuting party; the arm of the secular power was uplifted against them, and as St. Jerom expresses it, “ The whole world was astonished at its having become Arian.” *

If, therefore, it is supposed the Catholic Church had at any time promoted, abetted, and aided Persecution, and this by the corporal pains of imprisonment or death, by pecuniary mulcts or forfeiture of estate, it must have been after the Roman empire had been dismembered, and parcelled out into a multiplicity of states and kingdoms, by the invasions of the Goths, Vandals, and other barbarous nations; or rather after the western empire had been, for the most part, re-united under Charlemagne: but upon the most diligent enquiry into ecclesiastical and civil history, it can-

* Totus mundus miratus est se Arianum factum.

cannot be found that the Catholic Church ever used compulsion in the conversion of infidels and heretics, without previously convincing the understanding and correcting the heart: neither can it be asserted and maintained, with any foundation of truth, that she of herself, in virtue of any particular doctrine or interpretation of scripture, ever authorised Persecution to the loss of life or fortune on the account of heresy. She never has been decisive in this respect, but in conformity to scripture and the apostolical constitutions. When heretics have called in question the doctrines transmitted to her care by Christ and his apostles, she, in order to preserve inviolate that sacred depositum of Faith, has convened general or national councils, as best suited the occasion, and by their united suffrages, after a fair hearing and canvassing the matters in debate, has condemned them as repugnant to the word of God, and perhaps destructive of Christian morality. In this truly legal manner, and consonant to the prescript of the apostles, have been condemned all the heresies that ever sprouted up in the Church: and who will say that this is Persecution, or a restraint laid upon the intellects of men? No,

C

if

if we believe Christ and his apostles, it is not. St. Paul will have us captivate our intellects into the obedience of faith, as faith is the evidence of things that do not appear: so that, the whole charge of favouring Persecution in the Catholic Church will amount only to this, that the secular powers, members of that Church, do imprison, put to death, or otherwise maltreat, and subject to pains and penalties, such heretics, who persist, notwithstanding their condemnation by the ecclesiastical powers, in teaching and publishing their erroneous opinions, contrary to the peace and laws of the state. All this is very true: the police of every state in Europe, and in other parts of the world, where the Catholic religion is, or has been established, requires, in a great degree, this Persecution, for its tranquillity, safety, and permanency. But this Persecution is nothing more than that Political one, defined in the latter part of the foregoing chapter, therefore it cannot be said to proceed immediately from the Catholic Church, as taught, inculcated, or dictated by her; because, indeed, the spirit of the Catholic Church in this point, is no other than has been also defined and illustrated

illustrated under the denomination of *Religious Persecution*, in the same chapter.

I am well aware here of the objections that may be started, and seem to bear hard on Catholics, as if there was something in their principles that really tended to encourage the persecuting of all those who entertained opinions contrary to any of the tenets of their Church. For, if nothing of the kind can be imputed to their principles, and if their Church breathes nothing so much as lenity and compassion, with a sincere desire for the conversion of all sinners and those who have been seduced by error; how, with all these truly evangelical sentiments, should pope Innocent III. lay the first foundation of the Inquisition, a tribunal still subsisting, and erected in Spain, Portugal, and Italy, by his authority, to take cognizance of heresy, judaism, mahommedanism, sodomy, and polygamy? How could Catholics be guilty of the horrid massacres that were perpetrated on the Protestants in France and Ireland? And how could they contrive the Powder-plot, and several others, to the destruction of the Protestants in England? These objections are of moment, and deserve to be

cleared up : and, as first, the Inquisition was calculated for the suppression of the Albigenes, it will not be amiss to give here a short history of them.

The Albigenes were a general sect, composed of several heretics, who made their appearance in the twelfth century, and whose principal design was to overthrow the hierarchical order, to trouble the discipline of the Church, and to dissuade Christians from receiving the sacraments. They were so called, because Oliver, one of the disciples of Peter de Valdo, chief of the Vaudois or poor of Lyons, was the first that published their errors in Albi, a town of the Upper Languedoc, on the Tarn, and this town was, as it were, the center of the provinces which they infected with their opinions.

This heresy, which revived Manicheism, Arianism, and the other dogma's of the ancient sectaries, to which it added a diversity of errors peculiar to the different branches of the sect, had its first rise in Bulgaria. The Cathari, or Puritans, were the source from which it sprung ; and the Paulicians of Armenia having

ing conveyed it into Germany, Italy, and Provence, Peter de Bruys and Henry brought it, 'tis said, into Languedoc, and Arnaldus of Brescia fomented it, which occasioned the giving to those heretics the name of Henricians, Petrobusians, Arnaldists, Puritans, Piffres, Patarins, Weavers, Good-Men, Publicans, Passagians, &c. and to all of them afterwards the general name of Albigeneses.

These were properly Manicheans. The errors they stand accused of by Alanus, a monk of Citeaux, and Peter, a monk of Vaux-Cernay, the co-temporary authors that wrote against them, are, first, admitting two principles or two creatures, the one good, the other evil. The first, the creator of invisible and spiritual things; the second, the creator of the body, and author of the Old Testament, which they rejected, admitting the New, and yet rejecting the utility of the sacraments. Secondly, admitting two Christs: one wicked, who had appeared on earth with a fantastic body, as the Marcionites had pretended, and who had lived and rose from the dead only in appearance; the other good, but who had not been seen in this world. Thirdly, denying the resurrec-

tion of the flesh, and believing that our souls are either demons, or other souls lodged in our bodies in punishment of the crimes of their past life; consequently, denying purgatory, the necessity of prayers for the dead, and treating as fabulous the belief of the Catholics concerning hell. Fourthly, condemning all the sacraments of the Church; rejecting baptism as useless; abhorring the Eucharist; practising neither Confession nor Penance; and believing Marriage forbidden: to which may be added their hatred against the Ministers of the Church, and their contempt of images and relics. They were generally divided into two orders, the Perfect and the Believers. The Perfect led an austere and regular life, declaring an utter aversion against lies and swearing. The Believers, living as other men, and often in a very disorderly manner, imagined themselves saved by faith, and by the imposition only of the hands of the Perfect.

This heresy made in a short time so great a progress in the southern provinces of France, that in 1176 it was condemned in a council held at Lombez, and in the general council of Lateran in 1179. But notwithstanding the
zeal

zeal of St. Dominic, and the other inquisitors, these heretics multiplied greatly, and despised the anathema's of the Church. The temporal power at length joined the spiritual to exterminate them. A crusade was promulgated and entered into against them in 1210, and it was not till after eighteen years of a bloody war, that, abandoned by the Counts of Toulouse their protectors, and weakened by the victories of Simon de Montfort, the Albigenses, prosecuted in the ecclesiastical tribunals, and delivered over to the secular power, were intirely destroyed, except some who joined the Vaudois in the vallies of Piedmont, France and Savoy. When the New Reformed appeared, those heretics projected a Union with the Zuinglians, and at last joined the Calvinists in the reign of Francis I. The execution of Cabrieres and Merindol, completed the dissipating of the remains of this sect, of which now nothing is known but the name. But though the Albigenses joined the Vaudois, it must not be believed that the latter adopted their opinions; the Vaudois were never Manicheans, as M. Bossuet has shewn in his *History of the Variations*, book xi. *Petrus Vall. Gern. Sanderus, Baronius, Spondan. de Marca, Bossuet,*

Bossuet. Hist. des Variat. Dupin, Biblioth. eccles.
Siecl. XII. & XIII. Encyclopedie.

There are few or no Protestants of our days but would renounce all affinity with such pests of society, and would acknowledge that the institution of the Inquisition against them was a necessary and justifiable measure. The Inquisition was adopted in Spain and Portugal, as a check upon the Moors and Jews, who, for some temporal advantages, had embraced Christianity; but if these happened to be withdrawn, they returned to their old religion, or privately practised it, still enjoying their temporal benefits. Mere apostasy could not be the cause of its establishment in Italy. It was there probably held forth only *in terrorem*; and indeed the manner of its process has been generally mild, and rarely exercised in that country. It is said, that no person can be an informer, or give evidence in the Inquisition, whose immediate progenitors have been noted on account of any infamy for four generations. But it is generally averred by the Protestants, that the judges of this court take cognizance of crimes on common report, without any legal evidence, except what they themselves procure.

cure. Be the matter as it may, the Inquisition and the abuses committed in it, have been disclaimed by the generality of Catholics: there are several Catholic countries where it was never received, and where it is, the Princes long since jealous of the power delegated by it to ecclesiastics, would be glad to have it abolished; for, in fact, the true process of the Catholic Church in simply condemning, not the persons, but the doctrines of heretics, is fully sufficient, as the secular arm can do itself justice, whenever the least apprehensions occur of disturbance to the internal peace of the state.

The massacres in France and Ireland were truly horrid, quite repugnant to the Gospel of Christ, and no Catholic can or will justify them. Here we can only lament the depravity of human nature, and not any vice inherent to the Catholic Religion. On one side, we may pass in review a King and a Queen Mother, so much the more jealous of their authority, as they had great reason to suspect it was likely to be wrested out of their hands by a turbulent faction, which no reasonable terms of pacification seemed properly to satisfy. On the

the other side, we behold the Irish prompted to revenge by a course of unrelenting ill treatment. Motives for the preservation of a Religion exclusive of all others, were not therefore in the least instrumental towards bringing about a catastrophe so fatal to a number of Protestants in France and Ireland. We naturally detest treachery, and all the stratagems that are artfully contrived to secure its success; yet we cannot but blame those who by their misconduct have given occasion to the conspiracies formed against them. Where, from collating past circumstances of insurrection and rebellion, an intention seems still manifest of de-throning a King, or reducing his power; surely he will, if he cannot by open force, crush his inveterate enemies in the most convenient manner he possibly can. The histories of all countries furnish us with examples in this respect.

This was the case with Catherine de Medicis and Charles IX. of France. Religion was out of the question, though their zeal for it was pleaded as a specious pretext by some, and perhaps by themselves, for palliating a crime so shocking to humanity. It was anxiety for retain-

retaining a power which the Calvinists had already sapped the foundation of, that struck the blow. It would argue, no doubt, more the true Christian in a Prince to forfeit his crown, than to preserve it on such base terms: but how many Princes can be produced in whom the evangelical precept has precluded temporal interest? Very few instances indeed of the kind are to be met with. And if the love of the world prevails in most Princes, it may be supposed to prevail likewise more or less amongst the inferior classes of mankind, not by a sort of contagion spreading from Princes, but by a natural propensity to maintain and cherish the good things of this life, and in some even preferably to the good things of the other life, when, in consequence of an unhappy delusion, they are considered by them in the light of vague and abstracted notions.

According to such merely natural, and not spiritual dispositions, the temper of the Irish may be accounted for, when they came to a resolution of ridding themselves of the tyranny of the English and Scotch Protestants. These troublesome inmates, far from preaching up to them a purer light of the Gospel than

than that which they had already through a succession of many ages enjoyed, seemed solely intent on curtailing them of their lands and fortunes, and even entirely dispossessing them on the most frivolous pretences. One might think that Ireland, in these times, was not a sister country, though under the denomination of conquered, but some newly discovered region, like America, fit only to be consigned over to the plunder of a bold invader. Harassed therefore, and circumvented in a cruel manner as they were, their properties turned out so precarious a tenure, that dire necessity became the engine that set them to work. A favourable opportunity contributed also to facilitate their designs. England at this time was in confusion, by reason of the disagreement between the King and his Parliament; so that, when the reins of government are once relaxed, bad men, with a prospect of impunity, will be apt to undertake the worst things. There were besides many Protestants, both open and occult abettors of this bloody conspiracy of the Irish; and these were such with whom the odium of the Earl of Strafforde's despotic government was still recent. Revenge operated

operated from different causes, for the effects still subsisted.

The plots called Popish in England, were never properly ascertained. The powder-plot, still commemorated by a form of prayer, in the Church of England, is supposed to be hatched by some of King James I.'s ministers, whose heads, still fecundated with the many devices of the kind Queen Elizabeth's reign was so prolific in, could not help giving it birth. Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, is said to be the chief contriver of it, to discredit the interest of the Catholics with King James. There was, however, somewhat of a plot, and a-kin to that, or an improvement upon the scheme, for which at last Sir Walter Raleigh unjustly suffered. Some Catholics were engaged in it; among others, Sir Everard Digby, a man of great fortune and eminent abilities. It was to seize upon the Lady Elizabeth, and proclaim her Queen. Sir Everard persisted steadily to maintain his innocence as to the Powder-treason; and whatever the nature of his crime was against the state, he declared his being censured for it by the Priests and others of his Religion. Few are ignorant of Tonge's or Oates's plot;

D

and

and though Rapin is strenuous to prove its identity on the Catholics, all sober Protestants at this time are quite ashamed of it. However, a great many Catholics, and some of illustrious birth, were innocently put to death on this occasion, and otherwise suffered by fines, imprisonments, and a variety of ill usage.

The next point in the charge against Catholics is *Intolerance*, which is answered by what has been said in the first chapter concerning Political Persecution; so that we may proceed to the third part of the charge, which is *Uncharitableness*.

Protestants think it very heinous that Catholics should say, there is no saving faith but their own, and that all out of the pale of their Church are damned. This they call a spiritual Persecution, as haunting and tormenting the soul with dismal terrors and apprehensions. 'Tis true, Catholics say that there is no saving faith but their own; but they are far from confidently saying, that all out of the pale of their Church are damned. They have substantial reasons for believing that their Church is the only which has preserved the faith delivered by Christ

Christ to his apostles, and by the apostles to their successors, intire and inviolated. If so, theirs is the saving faith : and if “ without faith it is impossible to please God ;” of consequence, those that are destitute of faith are not in the way of salvation. There is nothing uncharitable in this belief ; it is rather charity to warn a person of his danger. But, says the Protestant, why do you confine the mercies of God ? your judgment is rash, and therefore uncharitable. I do not confine the mercies of God, replies the Catholic ; neither is my judgment rash. In the first place, the ever-gracious Author of Nature will undoubtedly have mercy on all those whose conceptions have been fettered under invincible ignorance, provided they observe that law of Nature written upon their hearts, “ do as you would be done by ;” but from those who have received lights and talents he will require an exact account of the uses they have put them to. Here also, where there may be an internal repose of conscience, and a perfect acquiescence of mind, which border upon an invincible ignorance of a truer system of faith, God will only look to the probity of the heart, and not the misguided understanding. Now, as the judgment

of Catholics cannot be accounted rash in restricting the mercies of God ; so, in the second place, it will not appear uncharitable ; for charity may be well considered as an act of the will, and as an act of the judgment. As an act of the will, no Church has exhibited more illustrious specimens of charity than the Catholic in willing the conversion of all sinners, Jews, Mohammedans, Pagans, Heretics and Schismatics ; and in not barely willing, but ardently praying and endeavouring for the same. Where are pastors more indefatigable in instructing their respective flocks, than among the Catholics ? Who bear the weight and heat of the day more than they ? Who are more zealous in displaying the beauties of holiness ? Who are more upright in their lives and conversation ? Who have taken more painful journies, or endured greater hardships, as missionaries, to convert infidels at the hazard of their lives ? All these particulars argue in the highest degree, the charitable spirit of the Catholic Church, as to charity proceeding from the will : And so far as it may be an act of judgment, it cannot be construed amiss when Catholics judge from the promises of Christ to his Church, that those who are not of that Church

Church are in danger of risquing their salvation ; for, if there was a want of charity in so judging, St. Paul, by the same reason, might be deemed uncharitable for judging, that *neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God*, 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10. Still the Protestant is displeased at this sentence pronounced by the Catholic Church, and fancies to mollify it, that the assertion must be merely political in order to retain Catholics in their own Communion, or gain over profelytes ; but, indeed, it is quite the reverse, being built upon such irrefragable conclusions, drawn from the scripture doctrine, that it cannot be contested. I well know, that many gentlemen of the Church of England cannot bear the use of the Athanasian Creed in their Liturgy, and wonder that their clergy are not so complaisant as to expunge it, because it makes holding to the Catholic faith the ground-work of salvation, and on this condition denounces everlasting perdition against those that do not. This, in their opinion, is a hard saying, yet is not less true ; and at such St. Paul seems to look with a pro-

phetic spirit, where he apprizes Timothy, *The time will come when they shall not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears.* 2 Tim. iv. 3.

There is another charge brought against Catholics, “ of not keeping faith with heretics,” which, as in some measure it seems collateral with Persecution, deserves to be here mentioned. Nothing is so unjust as this charge; it is quite false, and utterly disclaimed by all Catholics. There may be unjust men among them; liars, breakers of their word, promise, or covenant; guilty of fraud and deceit; but their religion does not teach them to be so: it rather laments that it entertains such rotten members in its bosom, striving to reclaim, and to bring them back into the paths of righteousness and the strictness of the gospel morality, by earnestly recommending to them the most consummate integrity in all their dealings with all mankind, whom as creatures of their common God and Father, “ who maketh his sun to rise on the just and on the unjust,” they are to live in charity with, and consider as their neighbours, friends, and brethren.

C H A P.

C H A P. III.

Of the Charge of PERSECUTION brought against Protestants by Catholics ; with which are considered the Causes that gave room to the Reformation ; the Proceedings of the first Reformers ; and a Conference of Cardinal du Perron with Beza on Schism.

HISTORY is the only evidence we can have recourse to in this discussion, and it may be said to afford a moral certainty, which in practice is as true as any other. Upon the faith of history such men existed as Alexander the Great and Julius Cæsar ; and belief, founded on such testimony, is as true as two and two make four. If we examine, by the test of history, into the grounds the first Reformers had of separating from the Catholic Church, we shall generally find it the result of some disgust, caprice, or base passion, and not the desire of seeking the glory of God, and the purity of a worship worthy of him. I readily grant that the Church at that time, and perhaps long before that time, wanted a Reformation,

mation, but it was a Reformation of Manners, and not of Faith. Many of the clergy lived very dissolute and undisciplined lives; their arrogance and ambition were frequently intolerable; and the laity, who had so many subjects of scandal before them, indulging the like carnal appetites, thought light of the moral duties of Religion, as not seeing them practised by those who should set the example; or whether or no they became remiss in the observance of them, they detested, at any rate, the clergy for their immorality, and would have been glad to see their usurped power in secular concerns annihilated. A Reformation, therefore, in Manners, was as much wanted as it was desired by all good Catholics, whether ecclesiastics or laymen; for, though the corruption was great, yet numbers retained, unblemished, the Spirit of Christ, and had not stooped their knee to the demons of pride, lust, and avarice. The ancient Romans, when they instituted their republic, and committed the government of it, for a year only, to consuls, alledged, as a reason for so doing*, that
it

* Ne mora senesceret imperium. FLOR.

it should not grow feeble, languid, or infirm, like old age, by being continued too long in the same hands : but as this sort of government cannot take place in ecclesiastical affairs, it were to be wished, that, in imitation of it, there was some coercive power to spirit up the executive part of Church discipline, in order to its stricter observance. This power should be supposed to act at least once a year, by a rigorous inquiry, whether the clergy have been punctual in the discharge of their respective duties ; and whether they have given scandal or bad example, by immorality in life, or any doctrine or practice that may have a vicious tendency. 'Tis true, annual visitations have been instituted for obtaining those laudable ends ; but it is thought, as the clergy have been generally found partial in their own favour, this care should not be committed entirely to them ; for if it is, the danger of Church government being relaxed, will constantly recur, and be always the cause, in weak minds, of defection from the faith and morality required by the Gospel. It is infinitely better that scandal should give offence, than truth be deserted.

From

From this true state of the case it appears what sort of a Reformation was wanted ; but as some turbulent spirits, from selfish views, are never easy, never satisfied, notwithstanding all the reasonable concessions that are made them, till they quite embroil affairs, and throw them into the utmost confusion ; a glaring instance of which we have in our Regicides of the last century : so the first Reformers, not content with invectives against the clergy, and the many abuses committed in the Church in consequence of their licentious conduct, proceeded to undermine the foundations of the very essence of Religion, first raising doubts about, and then peremptorily denying and rejecting several articles of faith, which, according to the best warrants of scripture and tradition, had been received and established in the Church from the time of the apostles to that day. Luther, who first sounded the alarm of Reformation in Germany, did it from a private pique to the court of Rome. Vexed that the Dominicans should have interest enough to wrest out of the hands of his brethren the Augustine friars, the distribution and preaching up of Indulgences, which for some time before had been assigned to them, he began to declaim
against

againſt the abuſes of indulgences, which, indeed, were then very great, and cried aloud for redreſs. Luther ſo far was right, and acted the part of a good Catholic; but he did not ſtop here. His animofity not allowing him to perceive, that an abuſe always argues the right uſe that may be made of a thing, he diſputed the right the Church had to grant Indulgences, called in queſtion the power of the Keys, and at laſt abſolutely denied the jurifdiction of the Pope. From his thus ſhaking off the authority of his lawful ſuperiors, ſprung, as from a very turbid ſource, all the other deluſions of his miſguided imagination; for a man, when he once ſets up for himſelf againſt a ſtrong party, combined to bring him to reaſon, muſt undertake ſomething extraordinary to create a belief of his importance. So it was with Luther: he forthwith broke through his vows of poverty, chaſtity, and obedience, which he ſays himſelf he had religiously kept for fifteen years together, and by marrying a nun, was acceſſary to her being guilty of the like prophanation. He ſoon publiſhed his errors concerning free-will, juſtification, and grace; he abuſed all his opponents in the moſt ſcandalous manner, particularly King Henry VIII.

of

of England ; he discarded most of the sacraments of the Church, calling St. James the apostle a * fool for recommending Extreme Unction ; and he ingenuously confessed that he would have also rejected the Real Presence in the Eucharist, whereby he would have given the most fatal blow to Popery, were not the words of scripture too express and strong against him.

But this fatal blow, which he dared not to strike himself, he saw, to his great mortification, given by Calvin, by Zuinglius at the head of the Sacramentarians, and by others, who all setting up likewise for themselves, affected, as principals, a right to as much power and authority to decide matters of faith as Luther himself, deriding at the same time, and putting him and his notions at defiance. Here we perceive a motley superstructure of new fangled doctrines, raised upon those of Luther ; but the tenets of Calvin, in a more particular manner, are subversive of all morality, if strictly followed by his adherents. We cannot think

* Delirat Jacobus.

think otherwise when we seriously examine his explanations of Justification, Predestination and Reprobation. 'Tis true, in after times, those of his sect, either ashamed of them, or sliding into more plausible modes of faith, endeavoured to dress them up in a more comely garb; yet that gloominess of thought, that passive state of the soul in regard to virtue, that retrospect to fatalism, are such strong ingredients in the composition of a Calvinist, that you must change the whole man before you can bring him over to the placid disposition of an active Christian.

The hatred of the first Reformers against the Catholic Church had not long continued, when it began, in some measure, to subside, and vent itself, by a sort of fresh vigour, against one another. It was natural for self-sufficient men, who had made themselves heads of parties, to be jealous of, and even to hate those who aspired to the like prerogative: besides, as their opinions were manifestly contradictory, it was an insult on their pride to own that they were in the wrong. We need not wonder therefore, if they stigmatized each other with the most opprobrious appellations; and if, far

E

from

from forming a coalition against their common enemy, the Catholics, they absolutely declined it. What then was the issue of those heart-burnings and feuds? Envy, malice, discord, confusion, seditions, tumults, insurrections, intolerance, persecution; were all exercised more unrelentingly against each other than the Catholics; for the Catholics at that time being almost every where the governing civil power, were in a condition to repel force by force, so that at first the animosity of the Reformers against them, could exert itself no otherwise than by some sudden tumults and insurrections. And, indeed, instead of allowing these Reformers to be men extraordinarily raised by God for teaching his law with greater truth and purity, we may well compare them to the Builders of the Tower of Babel, those rash and impious men, who measuring their narrow conceptions with omnipotence, designed to *make themselves a name*, by erecting a tower, *whose top might reach unto heaven; but God went down, and there confounded their language, that they might not understand one anothers speech.* Gen. ix. Their thoughts were so bewildered, their opinions so confounded, their dogma's so perplexed, that they were quite at a loss
 what

what to fix upon. Confessions upon confessions of faith were framed, but all to little purpose; there were still dissentients to claim the privilege of believing and worshipping as they pleased. Let none imagine, that what is here alledged is unsupported by historical truth; the author writes from a full conviction, that the very facts existed, as may be seen very amply set forth in the Bishop of Meaux's *History of the Variations of the Protestants*, and in a little Tract, intituled, *Fifty Reasons*, written by Prince Anthony Ulric of Brunswick, one who was very intelligent in the Principles of the Lutherans and Calvinists, and who had made the most diligent inquiry into the import of their several Confessions.

Who will now say that the finger of God was not here, and that the like fate will not wait, as it certainly does, all those who spurn lawful authority, and set up their private judgment in opposition to the decisions and unanimous voice of the Church of Christ? The unhappy consequences of the Reformation, and the perpetual dissensions and disagreements of the Reformed amongst themselves, are owing to nothing more than their asserting that the

Scriptures are the only rule of faith, as every private man may understand and interpret them. By this latitude given for understanding and judging the sense of the scriptures, without any unerring authority to have recourse to and abide by, an inlet is made to almost as many religions as there are heads. We have seen also most of the ancient heresies, condemned by the Catholic Church before the Reformation, revive and bud out anew in virtue of this rule of faith established by the Reformation. I do not speak of mere Deism. We have, alas! but too many here in England not ashamed of that character, men dignified in Church and State; and as inferior classes of men are but too apt to ape the fashions and sentiments of their superiors, we constantly see the tradesman and mechanic ridiculing, with impunity, the most sacred truths of scripture. Such are the blessings of the Gospel-liberty of the Reformation, and such its most delectable fruits! It is most certain, that scripture is and should be the Rule of faith of all Christians, and it is so acknowledged and revered by all Catholics; but scripture alone is not a competent rule of faith, as interpreted by this or that man, this or that head of a sect,

sect, or this or that sect taken collectively. Scripture is no otherwise the rule of faith, but as it has been interpreted by the apostles, their immediate successors, and the primitive fathers of the Church. To their interpretation the Church has always inviolably adhered in the decisions of her general councils; and these councils have the sanction of supreme authority and infallibility derived from the power of Christ committed to his Church, and the promises he made “to guide her by the Holy Ghost in all truth, ’till the consummation of all things.” This is then the sacred anchor of faith of all Catholics, and those that do not hold to it, are liable to be “tossed about by every wind of doctrine.”

Let us now seriously reflect, whether it was not infinitely better and more consonant to the spirit of a true Christian, for the first Reformers to remain in the Church, and remedy, to their utmost, any abuses complained of, than by separating from her, to break the unity of faith. Nothing can justify Schism; nothing can palliate, much less excuse, the offence of shaking off just authority. I remember to have read somewhere, many years since, an

account (but cannot now recollect the name of the book) of a conference between Beza and Cardinal du Perron, on the motives of their respective separation from the Communion they had been born and brought up in. Beza was originally a Catholic, and Cardinal du Perron a Calvinist. You see, Mr. Beza, said the Cardinal, a kind of disparity in our present religious profession: pray, inform me, what were your reasons for quitting the Catholic Church? Beza alledged the many abuses, corruptions, and errors, existing in the Church; some of which he had been an eye witness of himself, and others he had learned from the testimony and writings of persons of veracity. To this he added, that to avoid the infection, he thought it more eligible to associate with the Reformers, and labour with them to destroy what was noxious to true religion; confirming further what he said by the authority of scripture, *Every plant which my heavenly father hath not planted shall be rooted up.* Matt. xv. 13.

I should, from my heart, replied the Cardinal, applaud your notions, were they not too far led astray by the proud spirit of Schism. 'Tis very

ry true, that *every plant*, if you mean by it an article of faith, which God has not planted, *shall be rooted up*. All the power of the Catholic Church can neither make nor enforce an article of faith that is repugnant to the word of God; and all those who at any time have persuaded others into a belief contrary to the word of God, the Church, by the power and authority of God committed to her to judge of the true sense of his word, has condemned that belief, and has immediately endeavoured to eradicate it. But you must grant me that there is a wide difference between an article of faith, as such, acknowledged by the whole Church, and the abuse of that article of faith, the corruption of it, or an error of judgment in explaining it, by a single person, or perhaps more. An article of faith, as such, is, as it stands decided by the whole Church, to be conformable to the word of God; but the same article of faith may be abused and corrupted by wicked men to serve wicked purposes; or for want of right understanding it, may be interpreted in a wrong sense, though the party or parties, at the same time, may have no intention to err. I allow that the abuses, corruptions, and errors you complain of, have existed,

isted, do now partly exist, for aught I know, and may still exist, among several who profess themselves members of the Church; and that as noxious weeds they deserve to be rooted up; but I deny that they affect the essence of faith, which always does and will remain inviolate and incorrupt. There may be also opinions, doctrines and points of Discipline of the Church, which have not obtained the sanction of articles of faith, perverted by bad men to encourage bad practices. The same may be said of the opinions and doctrines of particular doctors of the Church. A Reformer, of candour, can no more draw consequences from them to the prejudice of the faith of the Catholic Church, than a Catholic of the same turn of mind can, from the particular dogma's of the Reformed divines, to the prejudice of the confessions of faith established by the Reformed synods. If an attack is made, it should be made on what is real, substantial, and stands confessed on either side, and not on the mere abuses, corruptions, and errors, which wicked or weak minds have been, perhaps, industrious to propagate. It is the part of a good Catholic Christian to labour strenuously in the vineyard of the Lord, and to be vigilant in rooting up every sick, weak, or corrupt

corrupt plant, and in lopping off every rotten or useless branch : all abuses, corruptions, and errors in points of faith and doctrine, are of this kind, and, as not planted by God, should be rooted up ; but who will pretend to root up the plants the heavenly Father has planted ? These plants, as articles of faith of the Catholic Church, bear good and delicious fruits ; and it is the business of the Reformer, before he attempts to prune off a bearing branch, or root up a vigorous plant, to bring full conviction of its sterility ; otherwise he must discover his want of skill, and that he is very insufficient to labour in the culture of Christ's vineyard.

Now, Sir, added the Cardinal, to take a nearer view of your reasons for relinquishing the Communion of the Catholic Church, they seem to aim at more directly the corrupt and superstitious practices of some monks and friars, than any universally acknowledged point of faith in the Church. You have recounted to me the extravagant pitch they have brought the Devotion of the blessed Virgin to, together with that of the patron saints of their orders ; and as other consequences of the doctrine of the invocation of saints, and the veneration of
their

their relics and images, you have enumerated many pious frauds and juggles : the strange legends that have been invented, the heavenly visions that were pretended to, the miracles that were forged, and a multiplicity of other absurdities to delude the minds of the unwary and ignorant, and keep them in a state of dependence.

I allow all these allegations to be, in a great degree, true : I am quite ashamed of them, and am exceeding sorry that such abuses have ever crept into the Church. As to the monks and friars, it cannot be denied, but that many of them have been very learned men, and eminent for true sanctity and integrity of life : others of them, whose intellects had been weak, took a wrong bias from a sort of mystic devotion, that had insensibly gained ground among them ; and others have done unseemly things, *turpis lucri gratiâ*. But do you think that these abuses, all proceeding from the depravity of man's heart, or the imbecility of his understanding, invalidate the essence of faith ? No, the Church teaches, but does not establish as an article of faith, that it is good and profitable to beg the intercession of the saints that reign

reign with Christ in his glory, declaring her intention that every prayer should be immediately directed to God, through Jesus Christ, who reigneth with Him in the unity of the Holy Ghost. The Church also, from the same motives, recommends the use of Indulgences, for mitigating the temporal punishment due to sin: the retaining of images and paintings for the purposes of decoration of churches, and as memorials of the triumphs of Christ and his saints; and the veneration of the relics of saints, as once the temples of the Holy Ghost. The Church, at any time, may set aside all these particulars as unnecessary, without hurting her faith; and considering them only as implements for exciting devotion, sooner than that a brother, weak in faith, should be scandalized, or that an open might be made for abuse, and the seduction of minds, it would be better if all images, relics, and the like, were quite annihilated by fire or otherwise, provided no contempt was implied by so doing.

Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, for wherein thou judgest, thou condemnest thyself, Rom. ii. 1. Nothing, Sir, can justify you, as a Schismatic; if there were abuses in the Church,
you

you should have remained in the Church to rectify them. If you was conveniently lodged in a magnificent palace, richly and beautifully adorned, would you desert it, if a few beasts had entered by some means into the hall, and defiled it with their ordure? No, a man of sense, sooner than desert so good and noble an habitation, would immediately set about clearing out the filth, and would prevent, if possible, such unclean animals from entering there again. The Church of Christ, a Church firmly founded upon a rock, “ against which the gates of hell shall never prevail,” is that magnificent and spacious palace, which is open to receive you again, like the prodigal child, with love and tenderness. Return to it, lest *after thy hardness and impenitent heart, thou treasure up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath, and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory and honour, and immortality; eternal life: but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness; indignation and wrath.* Rom. ii. 5, 6, 7, 8.

For

For my part, I have always thought with St. Paul, that *Christ cannot be divided*, 1 Cor. i. 13. and that all Christians should *be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment*, *ibid.* 10. and therefore on the approaches of death, I hope with the grace of God, to be able to say to myself, *I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous judge shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.* 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8.

C H A P. IV.

The same Argument continued, with a Review of the grounds for establishing the Reformation in England.

“**T**HOUGH the Lord,” says St. Augustine *, disputing against the Manicheans, “overthrows the kingdom of error
“ by his servants, yet he commands that men,
F “ con-

* Contra epistolam fundamenti.

“ considered as men, should be instructed and
 “ set right, not destroyed. Let those be an-
 “ gry with you, who know not the difficulty
 “ of coming at truth, and avoiding error.
 “ Let those be angry with you, who know
 “ not the difficulty of curing the mind’s eye,
 “ and enabling it to bear the light of its pro-
 “ per sun. Let those be angry with you,
 “ who know not with what groaning and
 “ pains the least knowledge of the Deity is
 “ acquired.” This passage of St. Augustin
 is a great lesson to all Christians, a lesson dic-
 tated from the benevolent effusions of the
 heart, that they should shew pity to one ano-
 ther by forbearance, rather than enmity by
 persecution; that they should instruct and set
 right those who are unhappily engaged in er-
 ror, rather than destroy without endeavouring
 to reclaim them by instruction. This is the
 command of God, and whoever acts con-
 trary to it, declares himself to be an infractor
 of it. This is the intention of the Catholic
 Church, conformable to the command of God.
 She has always struggled hard to overthrow
 the kingdom of error by God’s servants, the
 Faithful; yet, pursuant to God’s command,
 she has always considered men as men, objects
 of

of instruction and not of wrath. When she has found it difficult in curing the mind's eye, to dispel the mist that obstructed its clearer sight, its blindness still smote her with compassion, and she still hoped that a ray of reflection, descending from the Father of lights, would at length enable it to bear the light of the sun of faith.

If the reader is pleased to look back to the second chapter, he will find that what is here inculcated by St. Augustin, is there also, in regard to the spirit of the Catholic Church, as to the manner of condemning heresy, which cannot be construed into a design of favouring Persecution; so that, when a Protestant objects that such a pope, bishop, or priest, connived at, or openly or occultly was the abettor of Persecution; or that such a Catholic prince destroyed so many Protestants in his states, whom he judged to be perturbators of the public peace, and enemies to his government; or that such a body of Catholic men combined to rid themselves of injury and oppression, by murdering some Protestants, the authors of all their distresses and calamities: when a Protestant, I say, in this manner, charges the

whole body of the Catholic Church with the same disposition, he makes a very unfair and unlogical induction. The depravity here lies in man's heart, and in his vindictive spirit. He disobeys the command of God that counsels him patience and long-suffering; and he does not consider, that "vengeance is the Lord's, and that he will repay."

Persecution cannot therefore be imputed to the Catholic Church; for the universal spirit of benevolence that displays itself in her sentiments, excludes from her every idea of the kind. The Protestant may affect the same spirit of universal benevolence; but his motives, rather purely human, than directed to the honour of God, and the seeking of his glory, shew that the character but ill suits him. Self-interest is the predominant passion in the Protestant, wherever he has found an establishment; and to secure this establishment, and remove from his conscience the incumbrance of restraint, he will persecute all opponents who dare to dispute his pretensions. History furnishes us with numerous instances, which cannot be questioned, of Protestant vowing revenge against Protestants, and executing

cuting it severely. Lutherans have persecuted Calvinists, Calvinists Lutherans, and both have joined to persecute Anabaptists, Quakers, and others. Where one sect had gained the mastery over another, there was no toleration; and there would be little even at this day, where an establishment is fixed, were it not for the interposition of the authority of princes. If then Protestants can persecute those whom they must own as their brethren, by a better reason they will all conjointly persecute Catholics; for the maxim “ of * hating those you have injured,” will hold good in human prudence, though opposite to Christian charity.

It would lead too far to pass in review all the persecutions of Protestants against themselves and Catholics, in whatever part of the world they have been raised and exercised; so that it seems most advisable to confine our examination, on this head, to what has been transacted at home, because it may be supposed that there are but few among us unacquainted with our own history.

F 3

King

* *Proprium est odisse quem læseris.* PUB. SYR.

King Henry VIII. was the first here in England that authorized, in his own person, the breaking of the unity of the faith. He pretended scruples on account of his having married his brother's wife, though he had long cohabited with her, had several children by her, and had declared that she came a virgin to his bed. One should think that, according to the law of the Gospel, and the regulations that had taken place among Christians, since the establishment of christianity ; the incapacity of contracting and consummating marriage with a second wife during the life of the first, was a sufficient bar to him. Though Catherine was married to his brother Arthur, yet as her marriage was never consummated with Arthur, Henry could entertain no real scruple of living in incest ; for it is consummation that compleats the validity of matrimony ; therefore what God had so joined, no power on earth could separate. The Pope was earnestly solicited by the court of England to grant a divorce, but this was a point his dispensing power could not reach. It was superseded by the positive word of God, and all the canons and constitutions of the Church that were in force upon the article of matrimony.

Supposing,

Supposing, however, the Pope could grant a divorce, yet by so doing he must establish a very ill precedent; because every prince acknowledging his dispensing power, would, upon any frivolous pretext of putting away his wife, expect the same indulgence as Henry: even the nobles of the land would think they were intitled to a like privilege, and of course it would become fashionable among the commonalty. Besides the Pope, the principal universities, and the most eminent divines in Europe, were tampered with; but none were found, notwithstanding the lure of all-powerful gold, to belye their consciences, or openly second the designs of Henry. What should he do under this dilemma? love, engaging love, prompting him on one side, and surly religion checking him on the other. We may presume that he was very deeply enamoured, nay, as deeply smitten with the charms of Anne Boleyn, as Virgil describes Dido to be with the prowess and other excellencies of Æneas:

Hæret lateri lethalis arundo.

But we should always put the best construction on things, and not imagine that it was mere love for Anne Boleyn that had so rivetted itself
in

in the King's heart. The dame was not so coy, neither was her virtue so transcendant, as not to be contented with the condition of a handmaid, if she could not aspire to that of a wife. We may therefore think that Catherine, affording no great prospect of having any more children, the King desponded of being succeeded by heirs male, and therefore became uneasy. He perhaps also disliked, that in case of his daughter Mary's death without issue, his crown should devolve to the issue of either his two sisters. But here human prudence will not exculpate him; he should in conscience, and with an humble mind, have considered his case in common with many other illustrious kings and princes; he should have suffered Providence to act; he did not know what was reserved for him and his family in the ways of Providence, and consequently he ought not to have attempted to anticipate its designs. But Henry's philosophy was now so bent upon the medium of second causes, and Anne Boleyn's good flesh and blood (a reason also assigned for his marriage with Jane Seymour) was so tempting a bait for exciting desire, and withal did bid so fair towards the production of a vigorous male offspring, that
nothing

nothing could restrain him from executing the purpose of his soul. We now behold the "Defender of the Faith," a title bestowed on him by the Pope for defending it against Luther, ascend, by a quick gradation, to be supreme Head of the Church of England under Christ. All Europe was astonished at this unparalleled ambition, or rather presumption. The Catholics exclaimed against it, the Reformers scoffed at it. Some insinuated that he wanted to introduce Mohammedanism into England, and that to shew himself the good mussulman, and father of the faithful, he chose to be a Kaliph, or King and Pontiff, dignified both by the crown and the tiara. Others were impatient to have the honour of seeing him celebrate his first Mass *in Pontificalibus*; but were at the same time apprehensive, that the very moment he touched the censer he would be smitten with leprosy, as Uzziah, King of Judah was, for a like encroachment on the priestly office. Such were the ludicrous animadversions on King Henry's Papacy, or as it was otherwise called, keeping a Pope in his belly. But let us attend to Calvin's opinion of it, in his commentary upon the thirteenth verse of the seventh chapter of the book
of

of the prophet Amos. These are his words :
 “ They who at first so greatly extolled Henry,
 “ King of England, were certainly very in-
 “ considerate ; they complimented him with
 “ the supreme power over all things : this has
 “ always given me a great deal of concern.
 “ For it was blasphemy in them to call him
 “ supreme Head of the Church under Christ,
 “ and certainly more than they could justify.”
 No Protestant will suspect Calvin’s opinion of
 the regal Supremacy in England to be biased
 by any malicious design. He wrote from a
 full conviction of his mind ; he judged that it
 was supreme arrogance, that it was blasphemy,
 and that no man living could justify it. The
 ridicule and absurdity became greater, when
 the same title and power of the supreme
 Head of the Church under Christ, devolved
 to his daughter † Elizabeth : for, if the
 identity

* Qui initio tantopere extulerunt Henricum Regem
 Angliæ, certè fuerunt inconsiderati homines, dederunt
 illi summam rerum omnium potestatem ; & hoc me
 semper graviter vulneravit ; erant enim blasphemi cum
 vocarent eum summum Caput Ecclesiæ sub Christo, hoc
 certe fuit nimium.

† Queen Elizabeth is said to have imposed her hands
 on archbishop Whitgift, and others her bishops, at the
 time

identity of a She-pope, or pope Joan among the Catholics, remains a matter of doubt and could never be proved, it is not so with the identity of a pope Elizabeth, a pope Mary II. and a pope Anne in England. These were real Popes in petticoats, and Popes in their own right; unless we suppose the papacy suffered a subdivision between William III. and Mary II. and so became androgynous, partaking of both sexes, till the death of Mary again re-instated it in the powers of virility.

But raillery apart. Let us touch upon the nature of the power that invested King Henry VIII. with this high-sounding prerogative, this blasphemous jurisdiction as Calvin calls it, and dissolved his marriage with Catherine of Arragon. What was the power that was able to effect these mighty matters? it was nothing more than the Parliament of England: an assembly of men that acknowledge themselves fallible; for if they did not, they would not
so

time of their consecration. This story, however, may deserve a place in the Scandalous Chronicle. See the Politician's Catechism, first printed by Fitz-Herbert, and reprinted by N. N. in 1658.

so often have rescinded their own acts. An assembly of men, intirely calculated for judging and deciding in civil matters, and for enacting laws for the purposes of good government, according to the several contingencies of temporal concerns. But these same men could venture out of their latitude, and what the consciences of all the rest of Christendom abhorred as unjustifiable, they, with a composure of conscience, and acquiescence of mind in in well-doing, brought to pass. We must now regard them as perfect judges of the meaning of scripture; and that having deduced proper conclusions from the premisses they had laid down, they came to this final decision:

“ *It seemed good unto the Holy Ghost and to us,*
 “ Acts xv. 28. that the marriage of our King,
 “ Henry VIII. with Catherine of Arragon,
 “ is incestuous, and therefore we dissolve it.
 “ Also, that the same King and his successors,
 “ and not Peter, are the rock on which Christ
 “ built his Church, and are the very persons
 “ to whom he gave the charge of feeding his
 “ sheep and lambs, and therefore we constitute them supreme Heads of the Church
 “ under Christ.” From the proceedings of King Henry VIII’s parliament, such a blasphemous

phemous consequence as this may be drawn, and it is the very thing that revolted to such a degree the minds of all good Catholics, and filled Calvin and most of the Catholics with so much concern. But in justification of this parliament, it may be said, that though there were many who composed it, well versed in the art of adulation, and knew by it how to recommend themselves to the good graces of the King, yet others would not have turned out quite so obsequious, were they not intimidated by the arbitrary frowns of a tyrant, whose character was, *to spare no man in his wrath, nor woman in his lust*. There were, however, some, men of the strictest integrity, whom no menaces could over-awe into a compliance. The cause of God, and his religion, was debated, and they were responsible to him if they shamefully deserted it. Out of these I select Sir Thomas Moore and Cardinal Fisher, Bishop of Rochester. Lord Somers, in justifying the Revolution and the succession of King William III. availed himself of their arguments in favour of the right of Parliament to settle the succession, whom in such civil respects the people are bound in conscience to obey, and must not pretend to inquire whether

G

what

what they have done is upon just grounds. I
 shall quote Lord Somers's own words. "'Tis
 " well known, says he, how resolutely, even
 " to death, they refused the oath of succe-
 " sion, which the parliament had framed, be-
 " cause therein the King's supremacy was a-
 " vowed ; and, therefore, they cannot be sus-
 " pected to dissemble, when, at the very same
 " time they declared, that if that supremacy was
 " left out, they would willingly swear an oath
 " to maintain the succession of the crown to
 " the issue of the King's present marriage, as
 " it was then established by Parliament ; for
 " which they gave this reason, that this was
 " in the power of a parliament to determine,
 " but not who was supreme Head of the
 " Church. Sir Thomas went farther, and
 " owned a very strange opinion of their power
 " in this point, but he says it expressly at
 " the same time, that the parliament had un-
 " questionable authority in ordering of the suc-
 " cession ; and that the people were bound to
 " obey them therein." — These great and
 good men suffered death for their opposition to
 the King's measures : they were clear in their
 opinion, that the law of God was on their
 side, and could not be made void by any law
 of

of man; and as they lived innocently, so they died without regret. The rest of King Henry's reign was equally formidable to the Catholics and Reformers; each party, in their turn, felt his rod of persecution, and neither were since found inclined to compliment his memory with the least encomium.

After his death his maxims of government, with his supremacy, descended to his son Edward VI. The Reformers now began to rally their dejected spirits; but the grandees falling out among themselves, first, who should engross the greater quantity of abbey-lands; and next, who should have most power; the unhappy King, whose youth, like wax, was moulded into any shape and form, at the fancy of his insolent governors, fell a victim by slow poison, in the contest, after he had been drawn into a settlement in favour of Jane Grey, a young lady of many amiable qualities, but infected with the heterodox notions of the Hot-Gospellers, as the Protestants were then called. Her kingdom was overthrown in nine days time, which occasioned the bye-word of *a nine days wonder*, ever since made use of in England to express something extraordinary,

like a blazing meteor, that cannot long subsist. Mary then succeeding, pursuant to the will of her father, to whom the parliament had granted leave to settle the succession in that manner, procured all the acts of her father and brother, that tended to the disadvantage of the Catholic religion, to be abrogated. Her parliament was as obsequious to her in abolishing the regal supremacy, as it was before to her father, and afterwards again to her sister, in establishing it; which shews that this grand and favourite article of the Church of England's Creed, is truly more an emanation from the caprice of princes on one side, and the base flattery of the subject on the other, than the work and appointment of God.

Considering the character of Queen Elizabeth, the next successor, in a political light, and according to the measure of rectitude that seems so desirable for compleating the views of mere human prudence, we shall find it superior to all praise; great and glorious, indeed! an object worthy the study of the wisest princes, and at the same time a reproach to them, whenever the conscious thought leads them to reflect, that the manly sense of a woman has excelled

excelled theirs in the art of government. Reverse this character, or rather place it in opposition to the ways of the world, with a tendency to the ways of God, and you will discover its aspect to be very ill favoured: you will, in fine, perceive it to betray so many distempered symptoms, that you cannot help judging it to be unsound or unhealthy.

Elizabeth, in ascending the throne of England, took an oath to defend and maintain the Catholic religion, as the only and truly established religion of the state. Something very extraordinary must be the occasion of her afterwards falsifying this oath, which, pursuant to the intention of stipulated contracts, supposed in the presence of God, to be fully sufficient to bind man to man, was undoubtedly a solemn promise and sacred engagement, not rashly to be violated, and the rather, as made to a whole people. The sequel will shew, first, that it was not conscience that compelled her to break through this covenant. Secondly, it was not the prejudice of education; for though in defence of her father's marriage with Anne Boleyn, and consequently of her own legitimacy, she might give into the no-

tions of regal supremacy ; yet, as no alteration had been made in other points of the Catholic faith, during her father's reign, and as but a slight deviation did just appear in the reign of her brother, such faint shadows could not make her lose sight of the substance ; neither could they make any strong impressions upon her, in the form of an uncatholic education. Thirdly, it was not good policy in her, considering the state and disposition of the people of England ; the difficulty, if not danger, of overthrowing an established religion ; and the hazard of losing her own reputation. Ecclesiastical matters had been so ordered in the preceding reign, and so severe a check kept, in complaisance to Queen Mary, by the administration, upon the Reformers and the spreading of their doctrines, that at Queen Elizabeth's accession, no other religion but the Catholic could pretend to the sanction of an establishment. The Reformed, however, were still pretty numerous, but they dared not openly avow their principles ; they likewise wanted some powerful head to encourage them, and for want of such they were only like embers buried under ashes. Elizabeth was sensible of their impotent condition to blaze forth afresh,

afresh, and who should presume, without her concurrence, to rake into those ashes, and add fuel to their collected fire? She knew how well the people of England have always stood affected to the immediate heirs of their princes; and notwithstanding her father had caused her and her sister to be bastardised by his parliament, yet, as the same parliament had again legitimated them to succeed in reversion, as specified by his will, there was nothing to hinder her succession; and all were ready to receive her as their legal and rightful Queen. Considering therefore, I say, this disposition of the people, the difficulty, if not danger, of overthrowing an established religion, and the loss of her own reputation in receding from so solemn a promise confirmed by oath, it may be believed with good reason, she would, in consequence of the intention of that oath, have preserved and maintained the Catholic religion, had not some things intervened which might have ruined her if she had.

I speak here of human views, human measures, human interests; for it is the nature of mankind, I do not say of all in general, but of the far greater part, to seclude the prospect
of

of eternal welfare, when set in competition with that which is temporal. The one is to come, the other is present : the one may be deemed an abstracted or speculative notion, anticipated only by desire and hope ; the other is substantial, and recommended by the charms of actual enjoyment. On this foundation Religion is frequently postponed, nay even sacrificed to interest and reason of state. This was the real and extraordinary cause that urged Elizabeth to set aside the obligation of her oath, and she would, with all her heart, have preserved the Catholic religion, but it was not her interest so to do. I shall not, on this occasion, accuse her of the *lubido dominandi*, that lust after power, which *per fas atque nefas*, by all manner of means, whether licit or illicit, instigates to promote the happiness of security. No, I examine her as acting according to contingencies. The people of England called upon her to inherit a crown, which was her right in virtue of her father's will, ratified by parliament ; and it was natural to her to preserve to herself that right against all opponents that contested it. But let us see the beginning, progress, and issue of this affair.

The

The Popes at this time still affected a power which they had exercised for some centuries past, of disposing of the crowns of princes: at least, they required, that all the princes of their communion should do homage to them for their crowns, and accept them as a sort of fee from the See of Rome. The princes, that for certain reasons found it expedient to acknowledge this power in the popes, became, in a great measure, dependent on them; whilst others, justly resenting it as an imposition, esteemed their crowns and the prerogatives annexed to them; as rights devolving to them by hereditary descent, or conferred on them by the free voice of the people: they therefore disclaimed all such papal incroachments, holding themselves responsible to God only, and their people for their conduct. The contentions, not only on this head, but also with regard to the right of investitures, proceeding immediately from, or granted in fee of the See of Rome, were the source of many disorders in Church and State; and many acts of parliament were passed here in England long before the Reformation, to restrain any papal authority that interfered with these or other our national concerns. However, as
the

the Pope was held by all Christian princes, before the introduction of protestantism, to be the Vicar of Jesus Christ upon earth, in quality of his being the successor of St. Peter, the prince of the apostles ; as he was also reputed the common father of all the Faithful, and the arbitrator, umpire, and mediator of all the differences of princes among themselves, and with their subjects : it was customary even with those princes who were jealous of their independency, to notify to the Pope their accession to the crowns of their respective kingdoms, both for his approbation and a further confirmation of their right. Our Elizabeth, in obedience to this custom, dispatched her Envoy to the court of Rome : but what was his reception, and how unwelcome was the news he imparted to his royal mistress ? The Pope gave her the opprobrious name of Bastard ; he protested he would revoke none of his predecessors bulls, that condemned the proceedings of her father and brother ; he pronounced her to be guilty of presumption in ascending the throne ; and declared she must not expect the least favour, if she did not relinquish her pretensions, and abide entirely by the decision of the Holy See. This was carrying things to
an

an unjustifiable excess in the court of Rome ; the usage was too hard ; and as no mitigation of it was likely to be hoped for, it forced Elizabeth, contrary to her inclination, into the arms of the Protestant party. There was no other alternative that suited her interest. If she had continued stedfast to the Catholic religion, she must have acknowledged herself indebted for her crown to the special favour and condescension of the court of Rome, and as a consequence of this indulgence shewn her, she must have allowed the illegality of her father's marriage with Anne Boleyn. Here she could not help being under a strange dilemma ; for the grant of a crown from the See of Rome could not save her, in the eyes of the world, from being an usurper, the moment she owned herself illegitimate ; because it is well known, that in successions taking place in virtue of hereditary right, a bastard cannot exclude a legitimate heir, without making void a fundamental law of the state, and consequently without becoming an undoubted usurper.

It is thought by some, that notwithstanding these terrible menaces thundered at our Elizabeth from the Vatican, they would all have
termi-

terminated in a *brutum fulmen*, if, still adhering to the Catholic religion, she seemed to take no notice of them, and reposed herself on the love and fidelity of her subjects, to ascertain and defend her right and title to the crown, as they had before, by law, readily concurred to establish them. This might be a good political conjecture, for a cotemporary with Queen Elizabeth, and for one that was not in the secret of her affairs; but for us who, at this distance of time, are more inclined to bring real schemes and facts, than apparent ones, to a scrutiny: we, I say, who from historical monuments have been able to penetrate into the inmost recesses of the cabinets of princes, may be well allowed to think otherwise.

The Pope had already taken his measures, and he too had his interest to serve. The plan was laid, which he heartily concurred with, for dethroning Elizabeth, and giving away her crown to the Dauphin of France, married to Mary, Queen of Scots. It was not love for the Catholic religion, or view of consulting its security, that prevailed upon the Pope to second this project: no, all the intrigues of the court of France, and all its careffes, would have

have been ineffectual, had not the power of the King of Spain made him desirous to weaken it as much as possible, or find some safeguard against it. As he dreaded this power, it was natural for him to hate it; and therefore the union of France and England seemed to him a very desirable object to counteract, if not entirely to blast King Philip's designs of universal monarchy, whilst at the same time it would add more weight and authority to the See of Rome, by its being still able to retain an influence over, and guide the motions of the political ballance.

King Philip, on his side, was remarkable for a stretch of very refined politics; and it may be said of him, that he had more real hatred for France than zeal for the Catholic religion. Were it not for this hatred, Queen Elizabeth would never have sat upon the throne of England. He saved her life, when she was supposed to be concerned in the treason of Wiatt and Stafford, which last on his success, she is said to have agreed to marry. He also saved her life, when she was suspected of countenancing the doctrines of the Reformers. Queen Mary and her council had

H

come

come to a resolution to have her put to death
 on this occasion ; and though the charge was
 not clear against her, yet it was judged ad-
 visable to execute what they had resolved, by
 way of preventing any future mischief to the
 established religion. But Philip and his Spa-
 niards with great earnestness opposed this re-
 solution : “ They represented Elizabeth as
 “ extremely well affected to the Catholic cause ;
 “ that the unhappy circumstances of her birth
 “ were the only grounds for raising sinister
 “ suspicions to her prejudice ; that it was not
 “ rational to deem her accountable for the
 “ caprices of her father ; that the laws of the
 “ land had wiped off the stain of her illegiti-
 “ macy ; that he (Philip) as King-confort,
 “ reputed himself in conscience a guardian of
 “ those laws ; and that it would sully his re-
 “ putation, and be a means of questioning his
 “ integrity, if he consented to the death of a
 “ Princess, who had an immediate right to
 “ the succession after his Queen, if she left no
 “ issue. For, though innocent himself of
 “ her blood, he could not escape the censure
 “ of the world, as having privately some de-
 “ signs of his own on the English monarchy.”
 These remonstrances of King Philip, which
 he

he is reported to have delivered with a stern and peremptory air, calmed, in some degree, the apprehensions the Queen and her council were in of Elizabeth's deserting the Catholic faith, and in the end proved decisive of her worldly felicity, in obtaining the crown. Some have considered Philip as enamoured of Elizabeth, and that his fine speech in her defence, was calculated with a view to induce her to a return of love by marriage with him after Mary's death, the state of that Queen's health being then very precarious. But the truth is, his endeavours to extricate Elizabeth from danger, were a mere finesse to clear the way of all obstruction to his own political devices. He was sensible, that Mary Queen of Scots, with her French connections, would not be a fit Queen of England for his purpose; and therefore it was sound policy in him to preserve the succession to Elizabeth, even at the hazard of her establishing Protestantism in England. The event verified his conduct. He is said to be the first that transmitted to her the intelligence of the cause of her disgrace at Rome, desiring her to guard against the French, and pursue the measures that best suited her interest; and yet this prince, notwithstanding such sem-

blance of friendship, could afterwards pretend a zeal for religion, and undertake to dethrone her by his armada ; but the very Pope, Sixtus V. that had excommunicated Elizabeth, became on this emergency her fast friend, and constant correspondent : he helped to baffle Philip's plots, though concerted with all imaginable secrecy, to insure success ; and so great was his aversion to him, that it gave him a more singular pleasure to see heresy maintained in England, than to see Philip become master of it.

Some will be scandalized, imagining Popes particularly, from their sacred function, incapable of such duplicity of conduct, pretending to serve God and yet serving mammon : but in striving to search after truth, we must paint Man as he is, and not as he ought to be. A Pope, it is certain, should be attentive to nothing but the spiritual welfare of the Faithful in general ; all other avocations degrade the dignity of the character of the Pontiff and Holy Father. Many Popes, however, reputing themselves temporal as well as spiritual princes, presume they should be allowed to have likewise an interest to serve on the foot-
ing

ing of temporal concerns. No one will doubt but that they have; and as men, subject to frailties like others, perhaps too ardent a desire of promoting the temporal interest, may make them lose sight of the spiritual. Sixtus, long before he had favoured Queen Elizabeth against the Spanish invasion, gave several evident proofs of his favour to the Protestants in France, in opposition to the Spaniards that supported the League; insomuch that the Spaniards * threatened loudly to protest against him, and provide otherwise for the preservation of the Church which he had abandoned. More recent instances of a similar behaviour appear in the Popes Clement X. and Innocent XI. The first was governed entirely by Cardinal Altieri, who strained every nerve to thwart Lewis XIV. and check the rapidity of his conquests in the United Netherlands in 1672. The second considering our James II. as linked in counsels with France, was deaf to all his solicitations for giving a sanction to the re-establishment of the Catholic religion in England. Nothing that was encouraged in France

H 3

could

* Maimbourg Hist. de la Ligue.

could be relished by that Pope. Fearing to be crushed by the too great power Lewis XIV. seemed to grasp at, he was always glad when the Protestant powers were in a condition to bridle and reduce it.

Hence we see that princes are governed by interest, even frequently in direct opposition to conscience; and that this interest can be sometimes made, by dexterous management, to work so effectually on the minds of the people, as, in the case of Queen Elizabeth, that they will fondly imagine it to be their own, and submit themselves to be governed by it. Queen Elizabeth gained over far more protestants to espouse her interest, and abjure the court of Rome for its unseemly treatment of her, than she could expect if she had declared herself immediately a Protestant at her succession; so true it is, that the sufferer of wrongs creates a pity which reverts in hatred against the doer of them.

The die was now cast, she had also passed the Rubicon, and there was no retracting. A free toleration was granted at home to preach up any doctrine that was thought to be the doctrine of
the

the gospel : abroad all Protestants were invited to a coalition with her, in order to strengthen their common cause and common interest. An inundation of Reformers, in various shapes, soon deluged the whole land. One might say, that almost in every corner, some invisible agent had been playing the pranks of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Still the universities and the several orders of the clergy kept up the visibility of the ancient Church. It was necessary to weaken, gradually, their foundations. The most backward in the road of conscience, but most forward in the road of preferment, were found the fittest tools to be played off by the engines of state. The refractory were first made very uneasy in their situations, and after a course of ill usage, were at last dismissed as unprofitable servants : but all this was done by a sort of so imperceptible a shadowing, that there was no observing the hand that directed the traces of the pencil.

It may be a just inference, from all the circumstances hitherto related, that Elizabeth, in her state of separation from the Catholic Church, could glance with an indifferent eye at any mode of faith or religious worship, and
that,

that, in this respect, she had no particular favourite to fondle and gaze at in the true spirit of complacency. But policy suggested to her what she owed to the crown she wore, the scepter she swayed, and the bulk of the people she governed. Though men are prone to gape after novelties, and the people of England are particularly remarkable for their extreme curiosity ; yet as it is very hard to divest the mind of old notions, nurtured by education, and made strong by habit, she chose a form of Religion which made the least deviation from that which she found established ; and so that it might seem, not so much to exclude the old one intirely, as to dress it up in a new garb ; not so much to eradicate the old tree, as to graft on it a new stock. The people did not miss the pomp of the episcopal hierarchy, and most ecclesiastical functions were exercised according to the ceremonial of the former decorum. The doctrine and discipline of her brother Protestants at Geneva, were very little to her taste ; they clashed with her Headship of the Protestant religion ; they did not chime in with her imperial government and high notions of Prerogative ; they recommended the equality of mankind against the despotism of monarchs ;

monarchs : and in other points of view they appeared to her crude; jejune, sterile; yet replete with illiberal notions of the goodness of God, and the duties of his creatures. But by granting an unlimited toleration to these her Protestant brethren, in the beginning of her reign, she conjured up a spirit which she was never afterwards able to lay. They were a perpetual thorn in her flesh, and amidst the pangs of anguish they gave her, she was often heard to say, " That she knew very well what would content the Catholics, but did not know what would content the Puritans." Her saying was deemed prophetic in the next century, when they overthrew both Church and State ; but the mischief had been brooding ever since the year 1571, in the 13th year of her reign, when the Church of England received its first confidence by the publication of the XXXIX articles of its religion, and an injunction to subscribe to them ; as also to the Queen's Supremacy, and to the Book of Common Prayer.

The Catholics had been persecuted for some time before this æra, but their religious worship was not suppressed, by law, till the 23d Eliz.

Eliz. when, and in the subsequent reigns, at causes for new persecutions of them were pretended, they were subjected to divers penalties, forfeitures, disabilities, and inconveniencies, such as no body of subjects were ever yet treated with in any state. They must indeed, as judging from appearances, have a very bad opinion of Elizabeth's moral character, in falsifying her oath to defend and maintain the Catholic religion; and it is not to be questioned, if they had power to effect it, but they would have set up Mary Queen of Scots in her room, to be revenged of her perfidy. Elizabeth, therefore, on one side, and the Catholics on the other, must be considered as natural and implacable enemies to one another. She had ignominiously ejected them out of their *jus paternum*, the right of prescription they had from their ancestors, nay, from the first propagation of Christianity in England, to be the established Religion in the land; and if they had made attempts, during her reign, to recover that right, we cannot judge them to be so culpable on that account as they are commonly represented.

The Gospel counsels us to love and to do good to our enemies ; but self-love, so inherent to human nature, will often kick against this divine precept, and hatred and revenge will lurk in the heart. Few were so conspicuous for hatred as Elizabeth, and not only hatred, but a * long fostered deadly revenge. Mary, Queen of Scots, was the principal object of it ; and though perhaps as innocent in suing at the court of Rome for the crown of England, as the Lady Jane Grey was in accepting it, at the persuasion of the Earl of Northumberland ; yet for this crime, if it could be called a crime, when Elizabeth's legitimacy was disputed by all the Christian world, except the parliament of England, she was persecuted to death, and all her adherents ; witness the Duke of Norfolk, for his private treaty of marriage with her. Open force is tolerable, but no excuse can be given for occult malice, or malice masked with the specious gloss of friendship. Elizabeth proposed Leicester to her for a husband, and can we think it was with any other view than to

cut

* *Odia in longum jaciens quæ reconderet, auctaque promeret.* TAC.

cut short her days by poison, when we reflect a little on the private character of so base a villain? Mary escaped this snare, but it was her unhappy lot to have a more intimate knowledge of Elizabeth's resentment, when her promised place of refuge and hospitality was converted into a prison, and she at length did not find that mercy, which Elizabeth herself had found in her extremity.

But in closing this scene of horror, let us form some strictures on it. Was Queen Elizabeth's revenging herself on Mary Queen of Scots, the result of Mary's forcing her, by the French intrigues at the court of Rome, to become a Protestant for preserving her crown? Or was this revenge occasioned by any subsequent offence Mary had given? Or did Elizabeth only politically put her to death, to prevent her re-establishing the Catholic religion in England if she was to survive her? It appears from * history, that Mary, on her trial, had given ample justificative proofs of her innocence, as to any conspiracy she herself had
been

* See Robertson's History of Scotland.

been engaged in to deprive Queen Elizabeth of her crown whilst she was in England. If so, no subsequent offence was the cause of this revenge: for it was not just that the reputed heiress, by primogeniture, to the crown, should suffer for the conspiracy of others, though in her favour, if it was not proved that she had abetted them in it. It is not probable that Elizabeth put her to death on the prospect of her destroying the Protestant religion; for it is hard to destroy any religion when it has once taken root: and the Protestants, as a very strong party, in case of her surviving Elizabeth, might be presumed to bind her by conditions in their favour. Besides, as Queen Elizabeth never did acknowledge a successor, or even nominate one by will or before her death, it is plain this was not her motive. James I. Mary's son, was educated a Protestant, and if she thought fit to own him as her heir, she could procure his succession by parliament, in exclusion to his mother. The stress of the affair will then lie on the first question. Elizabeth hated the mother, and hated the son on the mother's account. Neither would have succeeded her, if she was able to prevent it. But it is odd, if not absurd to

I

think,

think, that her revenge on Mary, Queen of Scots, was merely for forcing her to become a Protestant. It is so; and the way of making herself an attonement for so doing, is likewise very unchristian and strange, to the last degree. But it seems to border very nearly on truth, and there have been instances of revenge of a like nature. Elizabeth, that founder and supreme Head of the Church of England under Christ; that persecutrix of the Catholics; that destroyer of their religious worship by penal laws, was therefore only a Protestant in outward appearance. Her excommunication is supposed to be taken off by the Pope, and his absolution and apostolical benediction given her, at the time of her connections with him to defeat the designs of the King of Spain. Sixtus, in applauding all her measures, rejoiced that it was the glory of his Pontificate to have cut off the head of the Count de Pepli: but none of his cotemporaries were, in his opinion, comparable to Elizabeth in greatness, * being able to strike off a crowned head,

* O beata scemina, che ai gustato el piacer di far saltare una testa coronata. D'AUBIGNE HIST. UNIVER.

head, and for this only he envied her felicity. As proofs of Elizabeth's believing the two chief contested points of the Catholic religion, viz. the Pope's Supremacy and the Real Presence, we find that she confessed to the *Sieur de Lansac*, that she was persuaded of the truth of the † first; and to the Spanish ambassador, of the ‡ second. She is said also to have made void the works of her own hands, and disowned the fruits of her apostolical mission, as Head of the Church, viz. her own § Bishops, by driving them away when they came to see her in her last illness, and stiling them Mock-bishops, and Hedge-presbyters.

I 2

I am

† Person. in *Resp. ad Coquum*, cap. 15. p. 363, 364, apud *Henricum Fitz-Simon* in *Britannomachia Ministrorum*, lib. 31. cap. 5. pag. 318.

‡ Comiti (postea Duci *Ferizæ*) realem Christi præsentiam esse juravit: quod ejusdem Ducis testantur ad Regem Literæ (Novembr. 16, anni 1558) in *Archivis Cymancæ* in *Hispania* conservatæ. *Id. IBID.*

§ Denique aversionem ejus a tota reformatione & grege Ministrorum, horror quem erga Pseudo-Episcopos in supremo morbo ad se accidentes præ se tulit, adeo eos Presbyteros *DE SEPIBUS* (phrasis ea est Anglorum erga mendicos & meretrices, victu testoque carentes) vocatos ab aspectu suo facessere jussit, luculenter demonstrat. *Id. Fitz-Simon, ibid.* He quotes *Discuss. Personii*, cap. 2. from page 216 to 220.

I am well aware, that, to soften these charges, it will be said, that the authors of them were Catholics, and consequently to be suspected of sincerity; and that Parsons especially, as a Jesuit, would contrive any thing for the support of his cause. Be it so; yet Parsons was an author of credit, and he might have come at a secret by means a Protestant could not. But Queen Elizabeth's belief of the Pope's Supremacy and the Real Presence, is founded on other authorities: and the belief of the latter, a Protestant may argue, was common to her with other Protestants, the Lutherans. As to the surmise of her being absolved by the Pope, no anecdote or history, public or secret, that we know of, authenticate that such a thing happened; and her discarding her Bishops in so scandalous a manner, may perhaps deserve farther confirmation, and a more unexceptionable authority.

However, from all that has been said, we cannot help thinking, that in affairs of religion she was not quite sincere on either side; and that she had been playing, during her whole reign, a downright politico-religious farce; and this, sometimes in conjunction with the Pope, and

and sometimes as her own fancy led her, with others. Remorse for having acted so treacherous a part, might be the cause of that deep melancholy, and mortal grief, of which she died. She might have regretted the loss of the Earl of Essex, but not through love, she was then an old woman. She felt no diminution of authority; it continued uncontrouled with her to the last. Something therefore must at last have stared her in the face, to weigh her down under so fixt a depression of spirits. O Conscience! thou accuser and judge of guilt, how sharp must be thy pangs, when thou openest to our astonished eyes, the sight of the tribunal of the Great God, with whom there is no exception of persons, and before whom all worldly craft vanisheth away as fleeting and as empty as a shadow!

CHAP. V.

*Considerations on the Penal Laws, enacted by the
Parliament of England against Catholics.*

IT is evident, from the several matters discussed and proved in the foregoing chapter,

that the establishment of the Reformed Doctrines in England, and of the Church of England, framed, for the most part, out of these Reformed Doctrines, is very little otherwise owing than to the determinate act of the will for gratifying lust on the side of King Henry VIII. and to the desire of preserving a crown, on the side of Queen Elizabeth. It is also evident, that the persecutions the Catholics drew upon themselves from these two princes, were for no other reason than their not countenancing, in Henry, what was unlawful according to the precept of the Gospel; and their being a little troublesome to Elizabeth, because she had broke her faith to them, and deserted their religion. It is, therefore, plain, who were the proper delinquents; who acted according to conscience, and who against it. Surely princes do not stand excusable for a manifest violation of the law of God. They will be judged by the Gospel as well as the meanest of their subjects; and if no salutary restraint was to be laid on them by the subject; if no laws were to be observed by them for the government of themselves as well as of others; if no expostulation for the wrongs they have done was to be admitted; all the world, long since,

since, would have been struck dumb under the menaces and oppression of Despotism. The Catholics, in slightly resisting those two princes, did nothing more than their duty, in virtue of sacred laws and sacred contracts; but if their remonstrances were vain, and they found themselves reduced to the necessity of submitting to the law of the stronger, that's no argument their cause was bad, or that they had no right to complain. They were not intruders upon any established religion before them; others were the intruders upon their establishment; and becoming more potent and formidable by the favour of the prince, like bold invaders, they laid forcible hands on their right, resolved to maintain possession.

This resolution of maintaining possession, laid the ground-work of all the Penal Laws that were afterwards contrived against the Catholics. The Eagle was caught in the net of state machinations, and it was ever after advisable to keep her wings clipped, and claws cut; for thus disabled, it was impossible she should ever again attempt to soar. Let it not be imagined, that the notion of serving God better as a Protestant than as a Catholic, ever entered

entered Queen Elizabeth's heart. No; the Religion she established was all a state trick; and if her successors thought it good, they did so, more perhaps from prejudice of education, than by examining into its merits. The Stuart family were often urged by the clamours of artful disturbers of the peace, to put Queen Elizabeth's Penal Laws in execution against the Catholics; they were even sometimes pushed on themselves to give their sanction to other laws, not less severe, for further annoying them and discrediting their religious worship; yet none of this family were ever known to speak disrespectfully of them. James I. tho' tutored in the school of Calvin, had no mean opinion of the doctrinal tenets and morality of the Catholics. His Queen, Anne of Denmark, is said to be reconciled to the Catholic Church before she died. Charles I. was so well pleased with his Catholic subjects, that he was himself suspected of being of their religion. Cromwell treated them with great lenity and indulgence. Charles II.'s easy temper yielded to his signing some acts of parliament, greatly to their prejudice. The Catholic peers were not excluded sitting in parliament till towards the latter end of his reign,
and

and many Catholic gentlemen served in the House of Commons. All the bitter persecutions in this reign against the Catholics, aimed indirectly at the Royal Family, were propagated by the shoots of the former rebellion, still subsisting in the calumny of Oates's plot, and the rancour displayed in the exclusion bill against the Duke of York. Yet the King was sensible that the Catholics were his best and most cordial friends; and God's providential care, so signal for protecting him in many occurrences of his life, did, notwithstanding his irregularities, accompany him to the end. By his mercy he repented, and died in the bosom of the Catholic Church. King William's partizans stimulated him to many acts of violence against the Catholics; but they were all merely political, calculated, as in Queen Elizabeth's reign, to secure the crown upon his head, and for their own preservation, as it was not very probable any terms would be granted them if James II. happened to be restored. The other measures, since concerted and entered into against the Catholics, all lean upon the basis of the Revolution, not with any direct hatred to the Catholic religion as such, but so far as it seems
to

to threaten the stability of the Protestant succession.

But how long must all those political preservatives, these reasons of State, this interest of the reigning Prince, hold the sword of Persecution unsheathed, and hanging over the necks of distressed Catholics? No Protestant can or will say that they are persecuted, as the Jews of old persecuted, on the supposition of doing God service. One should think, not so much considering things with the penetration of a philosophic eye, as upon a very cursory inspection, that the body politic, and the Church conjoined with that body politic, are in a crazy condition, when they cannot recommend themselves without the necessity of such supporters as penal laws. We can never apply to them these words of the scripture, *How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the Gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things!* Isa. lii. 7. and Rom. x. 15. Here is no Gospel of peace preached, no glad tidings of good things brought; but, instead thereof, the penal laws against Catholics abound with treasons and unaccountable felonies; they hang, draw, and quarter; they bridewell, imprison, banish, and sell

sell people into slavery ; ^{us} ~~land~~ ^{no} ~~goods~~, common right, and all the natural privileges of free-born Englishmen, are forfeited by them : people are often convicted in an arbitrary way, and one man is punished for the act of another ; the poor distressed widow and the helpless orphan do not escape their fury : and all this, not for any disloyalty, conspiracy, or disturbing the public peace ; not for injuring our neighbour or fellow-subjects ; for nothing criminal by any law, moral or divine ; but only for worshipping God according to the light he has given us, in the best manner we can, and which after a serious inquiry, and upon conviction of conscience, we apprehend to be acceptable to him.

There is no alternative for a Catholic in his option, in consequence of a rigorous execution of the penal laws, as he must either tamely submit to be destroyed and ruined in this world, in order to save his soul in the next ; or if he complies with the injunctions of the tests proposed to him, he must, as his conscience tells him, think of being damned for preferring a temporal to his eternal welfare. Here on either side he is encompassed with horrors ;

rors ; and by the frailty of human nature he
 oftener condescends to sympathise with the
 smiles of worldly felicity and security, than by
 his integrity to brave the storm, and stand up
 firm against its frowns : or, if he is shaken, and
 has not still fortitude enough to maintain the
 struggle, and resist with all his might, he flat-
 ters himself, like the Irish gentleman, that an
 act he was forced to for self-preservation, will
 not be imputed to him by God, and that he
 may still find mercy notwithstanding the apo-
 stacy of his mouth, as his heart had no share
 in it. This Irish gentleman was a Catholic,
 and besides a paternal estate which he enjoyed,
 was also next heir to a very plentiful fortune,
 coming to him from his uncle. According to
 a very iniquitous law enacted in Ireland, and
 still in force there in regard to Protestant Dis-
 coveries, as it is called, any relation of the
 next heir may become a Protestant and exclude
 him, if in a year and a day after, this heir does
 not think fit himself to become a Protestant in
 his own defence, and so save his estate. The
 uncle died, and not one, but many relations
 of the heir, read their recantations almost at
 the same time, in hopes of the succession, each
 for himself, and presuming the heir was so te-
 nacious

nacious of his religious principles, that no consideration could prevail upon him to alter them. The heir's year and a day expired, he recants himself, and frankly tells the parson, and all present in the church, his reason for so doing, " That he had rather trust God with " his soul, than any rascal with his estate." We see, from this example, what laudable conversions the Church of England makes; very few or none at all for conscience sake: this or that noble lord, this or that squire, turned to save his estate, or obtain one he had a right to, which he could not if he continued a Catholic. This or that Romish priest turned to get a wife; for as King Charles II. used to say on such conversions, " We have got a brother, and surely we shall soon have a sister." Yet they have all, according to the decency of announcing such matters of importance in the public papers, renounced the errors of the Church of Rome; and the Church of England must certainly be a good and gracious Church for opening the asylum of her faith and doctrines to such proselytes, though, at the same time, they do not believe one syllable of them.

K

But

But in regard to the Popery Laws in Ireland, which I have just now hinted at, in a cause that was tried by appeal from thence to the British House of Lords, in the last session of parliament, our present Head and Rock of the Law, its great ornament and lustre, the friend to truth, and the despiser of all the base artifices of injustice, was pleased to say on this occasion, " That the Popery Laws in Ireland, " and the construction there put upon them, " are a heap of monstrous absurdities and vile " oppression; that they are subversive of the " moral duties between man and man, and " consequently of natural justice; and that " they break in upon the law of conscience, " and encourage hypocrisy and a prophanation " of whatever is held most sacred in religion." Others, Heads of the law, not less respectable for their erudition, and for their great abilities and integrity in their profession, concurred with him in opinion. But are the Popery Laws in England more rational than those of Ireland? I fear their comparative excellence is much upon a par, though the scale is oftener made to weigh down in Ireland than in England. What can be said in favour of the many tests and oaths, which must be taken for
quali-

qualifications in Church and State? What can be more impious than to prophane the Holy Sacrament, by exposing it to so many indignities for the purposes of secular ends and designs? Protestants that believe the Real Presence, and how many are there that do? cannot, in conscience, take the test concerning Transubstantiation, or that the Sacrifice of the Mass is idolatrous. This is an oath that no set of men, in their wits, could frame; or they must be supposed immediately inspired, to be such competent and accurate judges of Scripture, contrary to the belief and practice of the Church of Christ in all ages. Alas! into what * devious paths will not the heart of man rove; in what inextricable labyrinths will he not puzzle himself, when he is intent on establishing a system of absurdities! If he did but consider the pernicious tendency of all such tests and penal laws, morality being rather degraded than improved by them, he would be readily convinced, that it is calling God's wisdom or power in question, by not foreseeing how, or being diffident of, or unable to, se-

K 2

cure

* O tortuose serpens qui per mille mæandros, flexuosæque fraudes, agitas quæta corda! VET. COM.

cure his religion and worship, without having recourse to such ignominious helps.

By consulting the foregoing chapter, or the history of our Kings, from the Reformation down to the present time, it may be seen what provocations, exigencies, and reasons of State there were for enacting these penal laws, and enforcing these tests; but if the same provocations, exigencies, and reasons of State do not now subsist, and perhaps may never more subsist, there is no just reason for their being continued. I will readily grant, that when Protestants act according to their avowed principles of moderation, they in fact, and from their heart, renounce all persecution; and the indulgence they shew to others, they hope to find themselves. But it seems they have acted in the Church of England contrary to these principles; they have lost sight of them, and have surpassed the Mahommedans, whose religion was propagated by the sword, in advancing a number of sanguinary, ruining laws. 'Tis true, I say again, that an Englishman, as a Protestant, disclaims them; and as peculiarly remarkable for good nature, beyond the genius and disposition of other people of the globe,

globe, he abhors them. How then can he stand out for keeping them still in force? He must know that these penal laws are intrinsically unjust, and repugnant to the divine law and natural equity. By his rule of faith, the word of God, as he understands it, he cannot help thinking, that he who believes according to the evidence of his own reason, is necessitated to that belief, and that to compel him against it, would be to compel him to renounce the most essential part of man, his Reason. For force here is persecution, and consequently not just; and persecution for conscience sake, or to be driven from the evidence of conscience by penalties and tests, is an unwarrantable tyranny.

It will not be amiss to consider too the state of the Catholic Peers in England; all of them of the prime and flower of the Nobility of the land, of titles and creations of long standing, and formerly distinguished for their eminent services to the crown and kingdom. Now how forlorn do they appear! How distressed their situation, from the penal and other laws! What does it now avail them to be born hereditary members of the King's Great Council?

K 3

They

They are deprived of this just right; and if this was not enough, they are harrassed in their property, and a mark of a sort of infamy is set upon them, by a double tax. Many other Nobles, of an inferior rank, of the same religious profession, with gentlemen, in whose veins still runs some of the best English blood, groan under the severities of the like Egyptian bondage. What shall I say of the shattered remains of the Irish Catholic Nobility? Their estates and fortunes were delivered over to plunder, and now the offspring of perhaps a common soldier, or subaltern in Cromwell's or King William's army, glories in the enjoyment of them, and blesses the happy times and laws that were able to keep them in possession. You have, fellow-countrymen! all you can desire, unless you have a mind still to pursue the blow, and persecute us to death. You have debarred us of worshipping God in our way; you have stript us of our fortunes; little else remains for the exercise of your indignation, but our lives. Take then these abject lives away; it is better they should be forfeited, and the spirit return pure and undefiled to God, from whom it came, than be polluted by the abomination of blasphemous tests.

tests. You now again seem to threaten us with those tests, for how otherwise can we construe the late enquiries into our number, our ages, and our professions? If the intention was benevolent, there was no manner of necessity for such enquiry, which in the main is fruitless as to any exactness in the number, though it may serve, by tendering the oaths to such as are known, and could not escape the enquiry, to proceed against them on any emergency, and all at once, as Popish Recusants.

But be the matter as it may, we must rest in expectation of the event, as time will shew all things in their native colours. Yet we hope that the nation is not destitute of sober, thinking, humane, and upright men, who will not be ashamed to plead our cause. The state is under no necessity of putting the Catholics upon the footing of other subjects; neither do the Catholics seem to require it. But the Catholics may be good subjects, if the state would permit them; and in order to their being made good subjects, it would be sound policy to withdraw the penal laws, and grant them a toleration of their religious worship, with a few other immunities and privileges. These particulars.

culars I shall endeavour to illustrate in the next chapter.

C H A P. VI.

Of the expediency of making the Catholics good Subjects.

IT may be a maxim in politics, that it is impossible to destroy a religion when it has once firmly rooted itself, and has prevailed in time and place. I do not here speak of impious sects, which Providence may have permitted for proving the Faithful: they vanished away in their own conceits, and little more than the name of them now remains. But I here speak of a religion conformable to the word of God, and which teaches and practises a true and unexceptionable morality. Such is the Catholic religion: it has been preached in all parts of the earth; in all parts it has had its votaries; and to this day you will find it in Asia, Africa, Europe, and America, professed and taught with little or no molestation from Mohammedans and Pagans. It was the primitive

mitive Christian religion in England, Scotland, and Ireland; and though the causes before recited had endeavoured to extirpate it; though penal laws and tests, “in smiting the shepherd had dispersed the sheep of the flock,” and made them insensibly fall off from the faith; and though numbers of its members, intimidated by the same penal laws, to save their fortunes and for other worldly considerations, had consented to temporize; yet it has still retained thousands in the British dominions, and will, by God’s help, wax stronger and more in number, to the end of the world.

On a supposition, therefore, of an impossibility of destroying the Catholic religion in the British empire, it would be prudent in a state, and in the prince that governs that state, to have no internal enemies that may annoy them in times of danger. If you will not seek, nor accept of a reconciliation with one you have made your enemy, how can it be expected, that he can have your interest and welfare at heart? ’Tis true, the number and power of English, Scots, and Irish Catholics, are so trifling, compared with the Protestant strength, that they may be treated with the contempt

David

David expresses of his own insignificancy to Saul; *After whom is the King of Israel come out? After whom dost thou pursue? After a dead dog, after a flea.* 1 Sam. xxiv. 14. Yes, the appellation of *dead dogs* and *fleas* may well suit them. They have no longer any * force left to think of making opposition; neither are their minds so haughty as to presume they are of any account: they might be reduced to a worse condition than their present, if sentiments of humanity did not plead pity for them, and if the laws that oppress them did not afford them some shelter. However, the advice is always good, and may be supported from several testimonies of history, that no enemy whatever ought to be held in a contemptible light, as some time or other he may find an opportunity to retaliate and obey the dictates of revenge. The British and Irish Catholics, tho' helpless in themselves, claim a fraternity with many other very respectable bodies of men throughout Europe, who doubtless would resent their further ill treatment, and, on the contrary, would be friends to England, and
would

* Non ea vis animo, nec tanta superbia victis. VIRG.

would rejoice to see them serve their God with more freedom, and disincumbered of the pressure of penal laws: What should retard this salutary work? The Catholics are willing to forgive and forget all past injuries; they are disposed to be good and faithful subjects; and they are ready to give a warrant of their fidelity and obedience to the government.

The only objection to their receiving any terms of accommodation from the British legislative powers, lies in two capital points: first, that they are attached to the banished Stuart family: secondly, that they acknowledge a power in the Pope, which is inconsistent with the laws of this realm. The Pope's power, as acknowledged by Catholics, I shall shew in the next chapter, to be purely spiritual, and to regard only matters of religion.

As to the first and most material point, the British and Irish Catholics have long been dis-
 used to consider with High-churchmen, as things not to be contested, the notions of hereditary and inalienable right, divine right, passive obedience, and non-resistance. These doctrines, they know, have been all exploded
 by

by the Revolution; and the Parliament then resuming a power, which they had before exercised, to dispose of the crown, it has ever since been properly elective, and no regard has been paid to direct hereditary right, nor to inalienable right, nor to divine right; the last being the consequence of succession by hereditary and inalienable right; because, *ipso facto*, that a people chuse a King, he is responsible to them for the observance of the contract he has entered into with them in order to be elected, and therefore cannot plead that his right, in virtue of hereditary succession, immediately and directly flows from God, and that to Him only he is accountable for his actions. It is certain that the parliament has this power, and it was never invalidated by any fair argument to the contrary, though many of our Kings have affected to reign by an hereditary and inalienable, and consequently a divine right; and though also their subjects had flattered them with such exalted ideas of a pre-eminence, not to be resisted, much less to admit of any misconstruction in the nature of its tenure. I have already mentioned, that this power of the parliament, was so far from being questioned by Sir Thomas Moore, and

and Fisher, bishop of Rochester, both martyrs to the Catholic cause, that they readily acquiesced in acknowledging it ; and were likewise of opinion, that the subjects are obliged to comply, in conscience, with whatever the parliament should regulate, in consequence of this power.

Now, if even the law of conscience cannot think itself justifiable before God, in superseding, by only a tacit aversion, without any ouvert malice, such law or act of civil power, it must therefore deem this power to be good and substantial, lawful and valid ; a power requiring submission and obedience, and binding to all intents and purposes whatsoever. Hereditary and inalienable right being therefore set aside by this power of parliament, the succession was made elective by the same power of parliament ; and to avoid the tumults and dissensions, the seditions and wars that often happen, as in Poland and Germany, from the contention and jarring interests of candidates for the crown, it wisely had a regard to the next heir, yet thought proper to stifle him, till the instant of his actual succession, *presumptive*, to cut short his hopes of being the *real* and un-

L

doubted

doubted heir, lest any thing should occur which might oblige the parliament to have recourse to their power, and alter the succession.

This distinction, therefore, between *hereditary right* and *elective right*, the latter derived from a power inherent to the parliament, the former the result of immediate heirship to the last possessor, clears up the whole mystery that had so long embarrassed the ideas of Catholics, Non-jurors, and the major part of the people of Scotland, though Presbyterians. They imagined the right of the crown in King William, Queen Mary, and Queen Anne, to be very equivocal, and could not conceive, on the accession of the house of Hanover, why such a wide breach should be made in the direct succession, as to place the crown on the head of a remote relation to the house of Stuart. But it was the will of the parliament to provide a Protestant heir, and it was in their power to make choice of him for their King. There can be no *plus ultra* in the argument, and all indiscriminately, throughout the British dominions, are indispensibly obliged in conscience to be obedient to this will, authority, and power of parliament.

As then, according to this establishment by parliament, His most Sacred Majesty, King George the Third, is our lawful and rightful King and Sovereign, all the Catholics in his dominions are ready and willing, I make no doubt, to take an oath of allegiance to him, and that oath, *bona fide*, in the sincerity of their hearts, and with a safe conscience, in manner following:

I A. B. an unworthy member of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic, Roman Church; in the presence of the most Holy and Undivided TRINITY, blessed for evermore; do swear, that I hold His most Sacred Majesty, GEORGE III. King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, to be my rightful King and lawful Sovereign, as by Law established; that I will obey and demean myself in all respects to him as a good subject, neither meditating myself, nor engaging in any Treason, Rebellion, or War; nor aiding, abetting, or encouraging others in any Treason, Rebellion, or War, against Him; and that I will truly and faithfully observe the same loyalty, and pay the same obedience to HIM whom the Parliament shall appoint for His successor.

So help me God.

If his Majesty and Parliament are pleased to accept this oath of allegiance from the Catholics, it is to be hoped all former animosities will subside against them, and that there will be a perfect union in mutual amity and benevolence among all parties, to promote the public good, and support his Majesty's government in honour and dignity.

It is an easy matter to content the Catholics, and this Queen Elizabeth knew, though she would not do it for private reasons of state. Allow them a toleration of their religious worship; secure to them their property in a more equitable and explicit manner than the precarious state it now hangs in; let them have the privilege of educating their own youth, in schools and seminaries of learning superintended by themselves; and you will surely bind them to you by the strictest ties of friendship and gratitude. Some, no doubt, will murmur at the first and last concessions. What, a toleration of Popery and Slavery, which we have been endeavouring since the Reformation to abolish, and to this superadded a privilege for educating their youth! To the first I answer, that it can cause no detriment to a state, where

where there is a necessity, for the internal repose of the state and the common good and benefit, of tolerating a multiplicity of religions, to tolerate any one particular worship, provided there is nothing in that worship which can corrupt the morals of the people, and encourage them to be bad subjects, by despising or otherwise injuring the government. The Catholic religion teaches the morality of the Gospel, in its greatest purity and strictness; and if its members were to observe and abide by the instructions given them, no manner of wickedness, either in intention, or action, could be found amongst them. But man is frail, concupiscence reigns in him, and he will sometimes prevaricate; and that every Protestant knows. If therefore no fault can be found with the morality taught by the Catholic religion, much less can fault be found with the form of its worship, which is quite harmless and innocent, and cannot in any shape hurt the welfare of the state. The Dutch, in their republic, though adopting Calvinism as their established Religion, tolerate the free exercise of all other religions. This they found themselves necessitated to do for the good of the state; and no inconveniency to it,

nor diminution in its prosperity, has ever appeared from this toleration. The King of Prussia, acting upon a like principle of benefit to the several countries he is possessed of, allows the free exercise of all religions, and his Catholic subjects are said to exceed in number his Protestant; they are employed under him in all capacities, and are loyal and faithful to him, upon motives both of honour and duty. The same may be said of other electorates and principalities in Germany, where Catholics and Protestants live intermixed, and in great harmony with one another; and even in some parts make, alternately, use of the same church for divine service. The emperor Trajan *, writing to Pliny, orders him not to persecute the Christians in any wise, unless he has sufficient proof of their attempting any thing to the prejudice of the government. Hence we see, that there was a distinction made by this good and brave Emperor, between the commonwealth and religion. The Jews themselves accused our Saviour before Pilate, not for any trespass against their religion, but
for

* Lib. 10. Epist. 97 & 98.

for treason, because he called himself King of the Jews, and stirred up the people. Judea was then subject to the Romans, and it was a crime of high treason to affect a kingship over a people that were a province of the Roman empire. It is therefore evident, that it is not any religion merely, which is criminal in a state, but rather any treason or rebellion that may be set on foot, by the professors of that religion, to annoy or subvert the government.

Therefore also, the toleration of the Catholic religion in England, and in other parts of the British empire, can be no manner of prejudice to the state, in consequence of their firm allegiance to the crown and government. Neither is there any fear of the introduction of Slavery with Popery ; for the Catholics love to be as free, in point of civil liberty, as any people on the globe. It is only by accident, and not by choice, that they have fallen under the jurisdiction of arbitrary princes in different parts of Europe. Wherever they could, they have formed themselves into republics ; witness those in Italy and Switzerland. If any slavish doctrines have ever been inculcated and preached up here, they were so by the Church
of

of England; and to that Church only must be attributed the doctrines of Passive Obedience, Non-resistance, and the Divine Right of Kings. The Catholics had no hand in promoting them: on the contrary, they were the very people that obtained the Great Charters of our liberties, which the Protestants now so much glory in; they were the very people that fought up to their knees in blood, in the Barons wars, against the despotism of our monarchs, and did not cease till they had founded our noble constitution, to restrain kingly power by a counterbalance in the supreme national council, styled the Parliament. Had it not been for their struggles, a parliament might never have existed in England for the good of the Protestants. Go now, and accuse the Catholics of Slavery!

If a toleration of their religious worship is granted them, it is natural to think, that the education of their youth by themselves should accompany it. This too may be a national benefit, and perhaps of some importance. Consider, for a moment, what sums of money annually go out of Great Britain and Ireland for the education of the youth of both sexes abroad; and not only for the article of education, but for

for the support of colleges, seminaries, and convents. All the money so expended, by allowing home education to Catholics, would circulate among ourselves, and be a saving to the nation ; and the colleges and seminaries would decay of course, when no longer supplied with pupils. Besides, the youth in those colleges and seminaries are taught not to think well of the government of their mother country, but to espouse and cherish the interest of that they are educated in. Such prejudice of education has accompanied some very worthy and honest men to their graves, and it can only be prevented by indulging the Catholics in the liberty of having their children brought up at home, in schools and seminaries conducted by themselves.

There is still another objection which deserves examination. It may be alledged, that if a toleration was granted to Catholics, it would be a means to spirit up their clergy to make converts ; whereas, as things now stand, being over-awed by penal laws, they are afraid to engage in such pursuits. I verily believe, that more conversions are made by Catholics under persecution, than there would be if they
were

were exempted from that apprehension. Suffered to live unpersecuted, they would be more moderate in attempts of the kind ; they would be careful not to give any umbrage to the government : but persecuted, they must naturally be supposed to exert themselves in strengthening their party, in collecting force from the rigour of opposition, and in * manning their hearts with fortitude, notwithstanding the prospect of punishment. Some persons, without any persuasion of a clergyman, or others, from their own reflections, “ trying all things, “ and seeking after that which is best,” become Catholics, and there is no law in the world that can deter them from executing what they have so purposed. Another cause of conversion to the Catholic religion, may be the supineness and indolent disposition of the established clergy, to instruct their flock and keep them to their duty. The Methodists, and other fanatics, on one side, and Deists and other infidels on the other, have made, within these few years, some large strides to debilitate the foundations of the Church of England ;
and

* Ducit opes animumque ferro. HOR.

and if ever this Church was in danger, that danger does not seem to be now far off. The very causes of conscience, that gave room here in England to the Reformation, and helped to overturn the Catholic religion, threaten the present established Church with the like dissolution. There seems to be no probable means for it to retrieve its honour, to revive the true spirit of Christianity, to emerge out of lax discipline, and to acquire respect, consistency, and stability, than to seek a union with the Catholic Church. A project for uniting the Church of England with the Gallican Church, in the view of uniting all the Western Churches, was concerted between Archbishop Wake and the Doctors of the Sorbonne, in the reign of King George I. But the projectors went the wrong way to work. The Schism would have been much wider, and they would have broke the unity of the Faith, a measure which, as I have before shewn, cannot be justified. They should have referred the matter immediately to the See of Rome, and then, as the Church of England agrees in almost all the Fundamentals and Essentials of Faith with the Catholics, and as other points might be amicably adjusted, by the parties coming

coming to a right understanding with each other, the negotiation would perhaps have prospered. I have long thought of a scheme for effecting so salutary an union, and do purpose, some time or other, to make it public. The government and subjects of England, will be so secured, in independency, that no encroachment, in any respect, of the See of Rome on them can be apprehended from the union; and yet the See of Rome will have reason to be well pleased and contented,

C H A P. VII.

Containing a short Illustration of some Points of Faith, wherein the Catholics differ from the Protestants; with Considerations on the Power of the Pope, shewing, that he neither can absolve Subjects from, nor dispense with, their Oath of Allegiance to their Prince.

FEW Protestants take a view of the Catholic Church, her Faith and her Doctrines, in the amiable light they deserve to be seen in. They are led aside from such a fair object of contemplation by their passions and prejudices,

prejudices, and these seem to be rooted and confirmed in them by the malice of misrepresentation. If our antagonists were found to deal candidly with us, disputes would soon be at an end. Instead of this candour, we are grossly slandered, and many things are imputed to us, which we absolutely reject as false and groundless. To obviate the ill consequences of such calumny is the design of this chapter ; and order might seem to require that it should be prefixed to what has been hitherto said, to dispose minds to think well of us ; but as truth has seldom recourse to stratagems of any kind, it was judged more eligible to convince the understanding without shewing proofs of an hypothesis, than by first demonstrating it, to create a good opinion in favour of its necessary deductions.

We must fix the truth of the Jewish religion upon the authority of God, who has spoken. We must also fix the truth of the Christian religion, deduced from the truth of the Jewish, upon the same authority. If the first is false, and had not the authority of God to establish and support it, the second is likewise false, as leaning upon the ground-

M

work

work of the first. We have many and substantial reasons to believe that the Jewish religion proceeded from the authority of God; therefore we have the same reasons to believe that the Christian religion has proceeded from the same authority. The authority of God, who has spoken, is what we call Revelation, and as an inducement to believe whatever God has revealed to us, we consider God as infinitely good, and infinitely true. God's infinite goodness extends to all his creatures by his general and universal laws; it neither intends nor does them harm. Man, the work also of his hands, and his delight as a rational being, feels, in a more particular manner, the influence of his gracious beneficence; it always wills and does him good; and though God has denied to him the knowledge of the ways of his Providence, yet he cannot help confessing, that its dispensations are wise, just, and good. Therefore God's goodness cannot be questioned by man. Therefore whatever it directs man to do, and to observe for pleasing him, must conduce to man's benefit. But God also is infinitely true, as a necessary consequence of his infinite goodness. If his goodness cannot permit him to injure us, so
neither

neither can his truth permit him to deceive us. It is impossible to conceive that what is infinitely good can be the cause of deception. Therefore God cannot lead us into error. Therefore whatever God has revealed to us is true. Therefore the Christian religion, revealed to us by the authority of God in the scriptures, is true; and consequently to please God, it demands peremptorily the belief of every man it has been preached to; and this from the authenticity of supernatural powers, signs, and wonders, attested by a number of men, who neither could be deceived themselves, nor could be supposed to succeed in a combination to deceive others.

We here see that reason anticipates belief; for it is our reasoning faculty that persuades us to judge, that what we believe upon the authority of a good and true God, cannot be amiss. Upon such foundation we make a right use of our reason in matters of faith; but make an ill use of it when we controvert any point of Revelation, as then immediately we doubt of God's goodness, and call his veracity in question; or else, by pride and presumption we put ourselves upon a level with God, daring to

correct his work. *But, if we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe, to the saving of the soul.* Heb. x. 39. We shall strive to keep our reason submissive, we shall enjoin it obedience to the will of God, knowing that by his authority, *faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.* Heb. xi. 1. If all the things proposed to our belief were plain and obvious to the understanding, if they appeared to us in the light of mathematical, metaphysical, or physical certainties, there would be then no faith, or no merit in our faith, because we believe them to be so, not upon the authority of God, but the testimony of our senses. There is therefore a necessity in Revelation to set aside this testimony of the senses. We must have recourse only to our purely intellectual faculties under the guidance of reason; and yet this reason must not build merely on its own light; it must not seek after evidence in itself. All it has to do, is to collate circumstances, to weigh them, to judge of their intrinsic value. This done; what is faith? *It is the evidence of things not seen.* Therefore there is an evidence in things not seen. But whence comes this evidence? Reason cannot find it in itself, but

but finds it in the authority and will of God, and finds it as an emanation from the treasures of the divine wisdom, and as a good and perfect gift descending from the father of lights. And now reason is silent ! Now reason unreservedly acquiesces ! Now reason, with awe and reverence, rests in the contemplation of so inscrutable, yet excellent an object !

We have therefore the authority of God, who is infinitely good and true, as a guarantee for our faith in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and for the truth of the Religion he established, as the only acceptable to God. Here must we hold, and not suffer our poor and narrow conceptions to wander in reasonings why God permitted the fall of the first man from his state of innocence ; why there was a necessity for an infinite satisfaction to repair the malice of the sin of disobedience in the first man, intailed upon his posterity, supposing even that malice to be in its nature infinite ; and why for the purposes of that reparation, the second Person of the Blessed Trinity became incarnate in the womb of a Virgin, and died upon a cross. Our thoughts must certainly be bewildered if we seek in ourselves a

sufficient reason for these things; still these things are true; they are revealed to us by the word of God. We may likewise imagine, that the ignominious death of the Son of God upon a cross, was unworthy of God; but this death was predicted long before he took flesh, long before it happened. So that the true and humble Christian, who lives by faith, can only answer such difficulties by asking with St. Paul, *Who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him?* 1 Cor. ii. 16. If the proud Philosopher, or any other who abides by the suggestions of his own reason, preferably to all other considerations, scoffs at, and loads such belief with reproachful contempt, the humble Christian will again answer him with St. Paul; *The natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.* Ib. 14.

It is this spiritual discernment that perceives the links of faith concatenated by the divine hand, when the carnal mind cannot know any thing of them. The just man, therefore, living by faith, discerns the end of the coming of Christ to be in a two-fold capacity: First,

as his Redeemer, by delivering him from the slavery of sin, and making him, through himself, acceptable to God: Secondly, as his Teacher, by instructing him in spiritual life, and shewing him that its reward is not to be found here on earth, but in heaven. Hence, man's heart should be raised to God in acts of perpetual praise and thanksgiving for benefits of so singular a nature. The first blessing requires his tacit adoration; the second, his exultation and joy. In the first, Faith captivates his understanding, and commands him not to be curious to fathom its immensity. In the second, Faith indulges his intellectual powers with greater liberties, and he, by taking these liberties, expatiates over this boundless abyss of divine love and goodness with exquisite pleasure, yet cannot help, at the same time to express his astonishment at so infinite a condescension. He observes, how before the coming of the Saviour, the world was over-run with Politheism and Idolatry; how all flesh had corrupted its ways; how man followed the devices and desires of his heart; how he prided himself in sin; nay, authorized and justified himself in the commission of it, from the example of his Gods; and how he thought
him-

himself of some consequence, put in competition with his Gods : but the Saviour had no sooner declared and entered upon his mission, than the bright light of his doctrine began to dissipate the clouds of man's understanding, clearing his fancy of vain delusion, correcting his heart with principles of true virtue, and replenishing his soul with the knowledge of himself, and of the almighty, infinite, and perfect God that made him. This change in the corruption of human nature was not effected by the persuasive words of human wisdom, but the teacher himself set the * example, and in his own person exhibited a pattern of the most consummate virtues. The law of nature received its last perfection from him; and the moral obligations of the Mosaic Law were enforced by him with greater energy, and taught to flow by him in the true channel of the beauty of holiness, by humility, self-denial, love of one another, and love of our enemies. Nothing therefore could amend the perverseness of human nature, nothing could recall it

* Longum iter per precepta, breve ac efficax per exempla. QUINT.

it to its primitive perfection in the designs of Providence, "but the appearance of God in the flesh, "but the Word was made flesh and dwelt "among us," and "God * was that Word;" his almighty FIAT ordered "the light to be, "and there was light."

Now the WORD, or Son of God, co-eternal, and of the same substance with his Father, that great EMANUEL, or God with us; that Lord JESUS CHRIST, or Saviour and King appointed over us, having out of his infinite mercy condescended to repair our nature, by assuming it; to heal our infirmities, by taking them upon himself; to teach us the way in which we should walk, by his example; and to render us acceptable to his heavenly father, and gain us admittance to be partakers of his happiness, glory, and immortality, by the merits of his redemption: Now, that WORD, I say, having done all those wonderful things for us, it is reasonable to be convinced that our love, homage, and obedience to him should be in as perfect a degree as we are capable of. It was he that heretofore created the world; "for

* Καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος.

“ for without him nothing was made that was made.” It was he that delivered the Ten Commandments to the Children of Israel from Mount Sinai, telling them, that as he was their Lord and God, who had brought them out of the Land of Egypt, and out of the House of Bondage, he had a right to impose Commandments on them. If then he had a right to impose Commandments on the Israelites and to give them a law for their observance, in virtue of having redeemed them from a corporal slavery ; by a much stronger reason he had a right to impose commandments on us Christians, and to give us a law for our observance, in virtue of his having redeemed us from the spiritual slavery of sin. The pre-eminence of the Christian Law above the Mosaic, is then in as great a degree as the immortal soul surpasses in excellence the mortal body. The Israelites had only temporal blessings promised them for the observance of the ceremonial and judicial law of Moses ; but Christians have eternal blessings promised them for observing the spiritual and sanctifying law of grace. The moral obligations of the law of Moses being the perfection of the law of nature, and the rule of God’s justice, merged into the law of Christ, and
abide

abide in it for ever: But the ceremonial obligations of the same law being only temporal shadows, types, and figures of Christ, the expected Messiah, and of the means he was to establish for sanctification; they were to be abrogated at his coming, and at the promulging of his law: The shadow was to vanish before the substance; the type and figure was to yield to the reality.

It is evident from the premises, that Christ did establish a law, and the most *perfect law*, which we find contained in the Gospel; that he also established certain means in this law for our sanctification, which we call the *Sacraments*; that by the authority of this law, we are to believe in him and his doctrines, and to observe the moral obligations of these doctrines; that belief in him, and his doctrines, is what we call *Faith*, and that observing the moral obligations of his doctrines, is what we call *Good Works*; that faith and good works are both indispensibly necessary to our salvation, as pleasing to God, and marks of our duty and fidelity to him in his service; that without a manifest risque of our salvation, we cannot separate faith from good works, nor good works from faith, because faith must always operate through charity, and charity through faith;
and

and because Christ has said: *Not every one, that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven: but he that doth the will of my father which is in heaven.* Matt. vii. 21. *Be ye therefore perfect, even as your father which is in heaven is perfect.* Matt. v. 48. That on the basis of faith and charity, Christ has erected a spiritual Kingdom to himself, by which he reigns in our hearts, and with which he is well pleased, having sanctified it by the merits of his redemption; that this spiritual kingdom is his Church, the members of which are all united under his government in the profession of the same faith, the participation of the same sacraments, and the communion of the same bond of charity; and that he has promised that this his church, or spiritual kingdom, shall not fail, but that the Holy Ghost shall guide it in all truth, to the consummation of all things.

There shall not therefore be an end of Christ's kingdom, nor of his priesthood; *The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent; Thou art a Priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedech.* Ps. cx. 4. But, as it was necessary for Christ to suffer, and so enter into his glory, Luke xxiv 26. and as Christ on that account, could not
 reign

reign any otherwise over his Church militant, than invisibly in the hearts of her saints and true and faithful members ; he therefore delegated the care of administering and governing his spiritual kingdom here on earth to his apostles and their successors after them. They are his visible vice-gerents, they act by his authority committed to them, and they conduct all the purposes of his government according to the prescript of the laws he has given them. Christ's own government of his spiritual kingdom, invisible to us, as he sits in heaven, on the right hand of his father, is truly monarchical and suffers no limitation ; but his visible government by vice-gerents, though also truly monarchical, suffers many limitations and restrictions. It is therefore a mixt monarchy, instituted in the order of the heavenly wisdom, to prevent frail man's abusing the exercise of the power entrusted to him. Christ chose twelve Apostles, as the vice-gerents that were immediately to succeed him on earth in the government of his Church ; but to one of these vice-gerents he gave a very particular charge beyond any of the rest, of feeding his sheep and lambs ; he prayed that his faith might not fail, and he called him the rock on

N

which

which he would build his Church, and against which the gates of hell should never prevail. Though all the Apostles, as constituted Christ's vice-gerents, may be supposed to be equal in power, having all the same commission to preach his Gospel, yet here for the purposes of unity, order, and regularity, a subordination was evidently established amongst them; they were to consider Peter as their Head, and they were to consider him as their chief Pastor in commission for feeding the flock of Christ. The words Head, Prince, King, and Shepherd of the People, were synonymous terms to signify the same thing among the Asiatics of old; and so we find them in Homer, the most ancient profane writer that we know of. But Shepherd of the people was peculiarly characteristic of a good and excellent prince, who having the prosperity of his subjects at heart, studies on all occasions to be of service to them, as the kind shepherd does to feed his flock in the best and fairest pastures. But it must not be imagined, that if St. Peter was appointed to be the Head of the Apostles, he had, in consequence of his primacy, an absolute and arbitrary power to controul, as he pleased, the wills and opinions of the rest of the Apostles. No;
such

such arbitrary power was incompatible with the government of Christ's kingdom of peace, unanimity, mildness, lenity, and humility. Peter's power extended no further than to convene his brethren upon any pressing necessity, to consult with them in common, to hear their advice, to submit his own to debate, and when all matters had been duly deliberated upon and adjusted, to execute their decisions, or recommend them to be put in execution. St. Paul withstood him to the face, and thought him to blame for paying too much deference to those of the circumcision; but St. Paul did not hereby dispute his being the head of the Apostles; he calls him Cephass himself, and he only reproves him for being cautious in giving offence to the converted Jews by too free a communication with the Gentiles. *Gal. ii.*

Whoever duly reflects upon the constitution of government in the Catholic Church of Christ, and the constitution of government in the commonwealth of England, will find between them a very great and striking analogy; and perhaps our Catholic ancestors, smitten with the charms of so excellent a form, had framed their government in imitation of it,

after they had began to draw breath, and had rid themselves of all dread from the frowns of arbitrary masters. In the Catholic Church, there is the Pope, or supreme representative and vicar of Jesus Christ upon earth, as being the successor of St. Peter in the See of Rome; and the particular Church of Rome, for this reason, is stiled the Mother and Mistress of all other Churches, and the invariable center of their unity. The Heads of other particular Churches, are also all Princes of the Catholic Church, and Vicars and Representatives of Jesus Christ in the districts of their respective governments; as are likewise all Priests; for they all represent Jesus Christ in the discharge of the functions of their ministry: but for the purposes of good government, the Priests are subordinate to the Bishops, the Bishops to the Archbishops, and all together to the supreme Representative of Jesus Christ, the Bishop of Rome. The Pope can decide nothing himself in the affairs of the Catholic Church without the advice of a privy council, or the advice of the whole Church, assembled in a general council. His privy council, consisting of a set number of Bishops, Cardinals, and other Ecclesiastics at Rome, lies under considerable restrictions in
its

its deliberations, and cannot extend to any cases of moment ; but the Pope, by and with the advice of a general council of the whole Church, and by the authority of the same, is infallible in his decisions. All those that are acquainted with the English constitution, may trace the analogy between it and that of the Catholic Church ; but with this difference, that the constitution of the one is temporal, subject to change, and is fallible in its decisions ; whereas the constitution of the other is spiritual, unchangeable, and infallible in its decisions. But as the pre-eminence of the Pope is a point much contested by Protestants, I shall endeavour to throw greater light on it, and particularly in the view that all Catholics consider it.

There are several reasons that oblige all Catholics, and even the greatest Catholic Princes, to render an extraordinary honour to the Pope, and it may be said, that duty in a very great degree obliges them to shew him all possible respect. He is, as St. Bernard expresses it, the High-Priest, the sovereign Pontiff, the Prince of Bishops, the Heir of the Apostles, and the Vicar of Jesus Christ : he is like unto

Abel in his Primacy, to Noah in his Government, to Abraham in his Patriarchate, to Melchisedech in his Order, to Aaron in his Dignity, to Samuel in the excellence of his judgment, and to St Peter in the power he had received from the Son of God; and by the authority of this power, he is the Head of Christians, the Pastor of the People, the Father of Kings, and God's Vice-gerent on earth. All these considerations have induced the far greater part of Christian Princes to treat the Pope with all imaginable respect, and more especially for the love of God, the supreme Lord of all, and mighty Ruler of Princes; who governing their states by his Providence, will the oftener favour them with his blessings, in proportion to the honour they pay to his chief Representative on earth, and not only to him, but to all his other Representatives, whose persons are sacred, from the indelible character of their Royal Priesthood. But if this motive had not a sufficiently powerful ascendant over the minds of Princes, to influence their deference for the Pope, they are, in some measure, obliged to it by a very important political reason, which is, to maintain themselves in peace. For it has been always
judged

judged necessary, though Princes now seem to decline all thoughts of so salutary an intention, that there should be between them, not so much an impartial Chief, as an universal Father of the whole Family of Jesus Christ, who might decide their differences, moderate, by his counsels, the violence of those who have engaged in unjust enterprizes, and unite their power and arms for guarding the Faith from the attempts of its natural enemies.

Now, if the Pope was made contemptible by the little respect Princes might bear him, what opinion should they have of his being able to effect those purposes? And what authority could he pretend to for appeasing their differences? They would force him to keep within the bounds of his spiritual power, without interfering in their temporal interests; and yet the fire of war would be kindled up amongst them with such heat, as to destroy themselves and their states in the flames; whereas each of them, receiving honourably his counsels, and honouring with respect his exhortations, his dignity is made venerable to all, and he finds it in his power to compose all differences, to render unto every one their due, to hold forth
the

the blessings of peace to the people, and to stop short the current of the injuries done them.

God, by establishing in the world two sorts of powers for governing it, formed such a barrier against the vanity of man, says the learned Hincmarus, writing to Carloman, and the bishops of France, that, to maintain them in humility, he was willing that the functions of their authority should be entirely distinct and separate. The persons possessed of these powers are subject to one another ; Kings to Ecclesiastics, and Ecclesiastics to Kings, yet without their powers being reciprocally dependent. 'Tis true, that the spiritual power is superior to the temporal, according to the order of dignity, but not to imply subjection and authority in any degree, that he who is vested with it, may strip sovereigns of their temporal power, or even moderate it. We must necessarily make a distinction between the subjection of persons and that of powers ; for tho' Jesus Christ had resolved, that all persons in the world should be subject to his Ministers, and all his Ministers subject to the King, thus giving unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's ; yet he

he was not willing that those two powers should be under any real subjection themselves, having given them both an equal authority for discharging their functions, and so as that the one should have no power to destroy the other.

According to this true state of the matter, the Supreme Head of the Church cannot assume any other quality, in regard to temporal princes, for accommodating their differences, than that of Mediator: he may have a power over their conscience, but not over their states, and the authority they have received from God, for governing them. In vain would he wrest the scepter out of their hands. All the proposals he should make them, can pass only for counsels. It may redound to his glory, as already observed, to be the means of pacification, but he cannot pretend to do it by authority. Neither should he be partial, or reserve to himself the favouring of any particular interest, for so soon as he is found to act such a part, he no longer deserves credit, and whatever he proposes may be deemed suspicious.

It cannot be denied, but that in former times some popes had arrogated to themselves

selves a power over princes, which was greatly to the prejudice of their authority, and the states they governed. In the reign of Lewis XIII. of France, a book was written and published by a Jesuit, named Sanctarellus, which treated of the power of the Pope over Kings, and was approved of by the General of his order, by the Pope's Vicar, and by the Master of the sacred Palace. His doctrine was thought to be very strange, teaching, that the popes have a power of direction, or of correction over princes : that they can not only excommunicate, but also deprive them of their kingdoms, and absolve their subjects from their oath of allegiance, either for heresy or apostasy, or for some great public crime, or for the insufficiency of their persons, or for not having defended the Church ; and his Holiness afterwards could give their states to whom he thought proper.

The politicians of these times attributed this book to the ambition of the Spaniards, who had recourse to all sorts of artifice for fomenting divisions in the states of other princes, in order the more easily to obtain the effect of their designs ; and their principal view then

 was,

was, to draw upon the King of France the hatred of all Christendom, for the succours he had given the Grisons and the Hollanders, and for the assistance some German princes, oppressed by the Spaniards, expected from him. But as it is not much to our purpose to inquire who the promoters of this strange opinion were, it may be sufficient to observe, that it then made a great noise among the learned, and was attacked by several answers in print. The Parisian faculty of divinity, in a full assembly, condemned it, though it was favoured by some remains of the old League; and not to leave the King's power unactive, on so important an occasion, the parliament, which was then the depository of it, cited the principal fathers of the Jesuits to appear before them, and obliged them to sign a declaration, whereby they condemned it, and to procure a like declaration to be subscribed by all the provincials and rectors, and by six elders of each of their colleges in France; and the parliament afterwards ordered the book to be burnt by the hands of the common executioner, with a prohibition to all booksellers to sell any of the like quality.

It

It will not be amiss to animadvert hereupon, that it is often a matter of not less importance, to hinder royal authority from being prejudiced by the publication of a pernicious doctrine, than to oppose the violence attempted against it by force of arms. Our Queen Elizabeth, who was exceeding jealous of her authority, used sometimes very aptly to say, that it was like the apple of the eye, which could not bear to be in the least touched, without feeling extreme pain; for, indeed, one cannot express how many misfortunes a state is exposed to, when this authority is ever so little invalidated. The magistracy, appointed in all states for preserving peace and administering justice, would, undoubtedly, be guilty of extreme weakness in suffering any power to pretend a right to strip their sovereign of his authority. It would be making a wide open to the Great, or others bent upon raising tumults and seditions, to persuade the people that a King is subject to some scandalous sin, or incapable of governing, or suspected of heresy, or an abettor of heretics; and it might also serve as a pretext to the ambition of strangers, to invade a kingdom so stigmatized, and perhaps reduce it to slavery. All should be far from countenancing so dangerous

gerous an opinion ; and accordingly we find it condemned as an error, by all the primitive fathers of the Catholic Church. None were bold enough to hazard such a thought, and it found no encouragement till within a few centuries past, in the time of Gregory VII. who was the first Pope that availed himself of it.

A King cannot cease to be a King, unless deposed by those who have constituted him such, or unless his conduct manifests a default in the conditions whereby his constituents have declared he should forfeit his authority. The French argued against Sanctarellus, in support of their Kings, that they were appointed by the hand of God, who had made use of their swords for placing the crown on their head ; and God had not laid down apostacy, heresy, or any other crime, as a condition to make void their authority, it being his will to make equally the good and bad to reign ; consequently, they could not be deposed but by God himself, nor forfeit their authority by any crime. Besides, if they could be deposed by the Popes, it would follow, that the Popes are their superiors in temporals, such deposition being an act of superior jurisdiction. But the Popes
O are

are so far from being superior to them in that point, that, on the contrary, the most renowned of antiquity have ingeniously declared, that they were inferior to them, and that their power was purely spiritual. There is ample testimony of this in a letter of Pope Gelasius to the Emperor Anastasius. Pelagius I. acknowledged the same, in a letter to Childebert, King of France; and St. Gregory to the Emperor Mauritius, and in such express terms, that their intention cannot be doubtful.

The French partizans of the divine right of their Kings, proceeded also to consider the argument in another point of view, against some more moderate antagonists, in favour of Sanctarellus's opinion. These alledged, that the power of deposing Kings, attributed to the Pope, is not, in reality, direct, because exercised not so much by divesting them of the power of commanding, as by dispensing the subject from the obedience he had promised them. The answer was, that this subterfuge was very frivolous, because the Popes cannot dispense with a divine right, and because the obedience due to Kings, is commanded by the divine authority in a hundred passages of the scripture.

scripture. They went farther, and said, that it is not in the power of Kings to subject themselves to the condition, of their subjects being discharged from their obedience upon any account whatsoever; because they cannot prejudice the royal authority that was deposited in their hands, and are obliged to make a return of it intire, and not mutilated, to their successors. Whence, Philip the Long, willing to make a treaty with his subjects of Flanders, and to grant them, as security, that it should be allowed them to take up arms against him, and withdraw themselves from their obedience, if he prevaricated on his part: he was hindered by those of his council, who remonstrated to him, that his Majesty could be allowed no such condition.

I have dwelt thus long upon this point, to shew what the sentiments of the Catholics really are concerning the power of the Pope; and no Protestant can properly take umbrage at them. The arguments insisted upon, have been, for the most part, borrowed from a French history of the ministry of Cardinal Richlieu, written in the last century; and their antiquity sufficiently evinces, that the Ca-

tholics have been long clear of the imputation of believing that there is any power in the Pope able to affect the temporal concerns of Princes : consequently the crown of England, in shewing the Catholics any favour, can be under no apprehension of their having any other temporal interest to serve, but that of their country. As to an authority, entirely confined to spirituals, it is quite out of the question, and can be no manner of impediment to their approving themselves good subjects, unless it is thought that this spiritual authority can dispense with their oath of allegiance, which, indeed, it cannot ; for, when once taken, it is binding in conscience, and no power on earth, spiritual or temporal, can dissolve an obligation so solemnly ratified, and even ratified in heaven.

I shall now make a summary of the Catholic Profession of Faith, that the Protestants may see how far they have misrepresented it. A simple exposition of the kind is always allowable, and can give no offence ; because when people mistake your principles, either wilfully or ignorantly, some very absurd and preposterous conclusions may be drawn from them.

The

The Catholics believe the Scriptures, according to the Canon received by them, to be divinely inspired, and therefore the will and word of God, revealed and spoken unto man in order to his salvation. What is called the Apocrypha, they read and use for the instruction of life, but not to build faith thereon for the proof of any doctrine. The Scriptures are their Rule of Faith, not as interpreted by private judgments, but by the Church, whose authority, in this respect, they revere as indisputable, for the reasons produced in chap. III. Besides the written word of God, they hold an unwritten word, which they call Tradition. “ This * was the first rule of Christianity ; and when the writings of the New Testament were added, this unwritten word did not, upon that account, lose its authority ; which makes Catholics receive, with equal veneration, all that was ever taught by the Apostles, whether by writing or by word of mouth, as St. Paul himself has expressly declared,” *Therefore, brethren,*

O 3

stand

* See Bishop of Meaux's Exposition of the Catholic Faith. Sect. XVIII.

Stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle. 2 Theff.

ii. 15. They believe the Apostles, the Nicene and Athanasian creeds, as all three conformable to the word of God : the first they use in their common prayers, the second in their Liturgy, and the third occasionally in the office of the Church. They hold seven sacraments, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, and Matrimony. These are all means for sanctification, when worthily received, though not necessary to all, nor all immediately necessary to salvation. Two of them were instituted by Christ himself, viz. Baptism and the Eucharist ; and the rest by the Apostles, according to Christ's particular instructions ; for they all have the warrant of the written word of God, have the matter and form required for sacraments, and are sensible signs of the invisible grace, conveyed to the humble and well disposed soul. The Church of England has set aside Extreme Unction in practice, though it does not deny its use in the primitive Church, nor dispute the Epistle of St. James that authenticates it, to be canonical Scripture. The other four it has adopted, though not under the

the denomination of Sacraments. I cannot see, however, what should hinder their retaining that name; for in the Church of England Catechism, the question being asked, "How many sacraments hath Christ ordained in his Church?" the answer says, "Two only, as generally necessary to salvation;" whereby it seems to be implied, that there are more, or may be more, but not so necessary to salvation as Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which Christ himself had instituted. I must confess, notwithstanding, that the words *generally necessary*, admit of great ambiguity in discourse, a signal fault in a Definition, the terms of which should be so clear, as to leave no room for equivocation. If the import of *generally* be *absolutely*, the sense of the whole will be so affirmative, as to admit of no restriction in its universality, otherwise *generally* will signify no more, than that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are not quite so necessary to salvation, but that they may be omitted: for a thing is only necessary two ways, either simply for serving a purpose, or absolutely for serving the same purpose. A horse or vehicle is simply necessary for the purpose of performing a journey, but not absolutely, because that journey may

be

be performed a-foot. Now, as the word *generally* cannot denote an universal affirmative, it must be resolved into, *simply, or a thing of mere convenience, and wanted, in no degree, of absolute necessity*; which construction opens a wide door to diffidence and scepticism in the two capital articles of a Christian's sanctification.

But leaving this doubt to be cleared up by the divines of the Church of England, I must throw together some reflections on the Eucharist, a sacrament, which most of the Reformers have not dared to expunge, though some have; but they have embarrassed it in such labyrinth of intricacies; and so confounded the intent and meaning of it in a multiplicity of opinion and disceptation, that very few of them believe alike, or indeed know what to believe concerning it.

There is no part of Christ's doctrine he took more particular pains to inculcate than this. The Gospel of St. John, chap. vi. records, how he had prepared his beloved Apostles and Disciples for it long before its institution. St. Paul, who was afterwards called to be an Apostle, *not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ,*

Christ, and God the Father. Gal. i. 1. tells the Corinthians how he had *received of the Lord*, by a particular revelation, his institution of this sacrament, *which he also had delivered unto them.* 1 Cor. xi. 23. St. Luke emphatically expresses the longing Christ had to impart this pledge of his infinite love and blessing to mankind: *With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer.* Luke xxii. 15. If we reflect a moment, we cannot help being persuaded but that there was something very extraordinary in this behaviour of Christ, and that he must have some great and glorious design in view by the institution of this sacrament. Let us read attentively over, and with a mind prepared, by the humility of the heart, for receiving instruction, the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, and we shall discover this design of Christ. He was willing, by an intimate and mystic union, to be always with his Church, that he might present her to God, his father, acceptable and lovely, holy and beautiful, pure and undefiled, without spot or wrinkle: So also, he was willing to be intimately and mystically united with every one of the members of his Church, who should seek this union in newness of life, and beauty of
he-

holiness ; and the means, as a seal fixed upon such newness of life, and beauty of holiness, and as a pledge of his union, was to be the participation of his body and blood. *Who so eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father : so, he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.* John vi. 54, 55, 56, 57. Let us not now strive amongst ourselves, as the Jews and Capernaïtes of old did, saying, *how can this man give us his flesh to eat ?* Ib. 52. *This is an hard saying, who can hear it ?* Ib. 60. Rather let us say with St. Peter ; *Lord, to whom shall we go ? Thou hast the words of eternal life.* Ib. 68. The Capernaïtes understood the eating of Christ's body to be in a carnal and gross manner ; but Christ himself undeceived them ; *It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing : The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life.* Ib. 63. Christ is then himself the spiritual food of the soul, and by this spiritual food he becomes its spiritual life, being really and substantially, body and blood, soul and

and divinity, present to and united with, the members of his mystical body, the Church, and that in a very intimate manner, by means of this sacrament.

Such is the doctrine of the Catholic Church, deduced from the express words of the scripture, in regard to the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist; and it has been always invariably believed and maintained in the Church, from the beginning to this day; and so we find it in all the ancient Liturgies, Syriac, Coptic, Arabic, Mosarabic, Greek, and Latin. The Protestants cannot make any rational objection to the contrary, and it is in vain for them to say, St. Chrysostome, in particular, did not believe Transubstantiation, as appears from his Epistle to the Monk Cæsarius. St. Chrysostome believed all that was necessary to be believed concerning the Real Presence, and we find this belief set forth in his own Liturgy. The term *Transubstantiation* was not then known, but what is now meant by that term was then very well known. It was afterwards used against Berengarius, and again more freely adopted in contradistinction to the *Consubstantiation*, or *Impanation* that was first asserted by Wick-

Wickliffe, and not by Luther, who only copied Wickliffe's opinion. The Church, no doubt, can at all times make use of an explanatory term; and so she before did, in condemning the Arian Heresy, of the terms, *ὁμοούσιος, οὐσία, ὑπόστασις*, to which the Arians opposed their term of *ὁμοιούσιος*. The Protestant, in disputing against Transubstantiation, cannot dispute the power of God, in changing one substance into another. Let him read over the miracles wrought by Moses in Egypt; let him examine the New Testament, where, among other things, he will find water changed into wine. But he here finds a constant relation of his senses. 'Tis true; and if he was to find the same in the change of the elements of bread and wine in the Eucharist, it would be no longer a mystery of faith, no longer an object of faith. Descartes, when he placed the essence of matter in actual extension, and was asked by Father Mersenne, how he could justify his opinion, as the body of Christ was in the Eucharist without actual extension, he said that God could make possible supernaturally, what was impossible in a natural way; and hence we see that as the body of Christ cannot be actually extended in the Eucharist,

it

it must be there in a spiritual and supernatural way, excluding every other substance.

There is an Act of the Parliament of England, 30 Car. II. stat. 2. cap. 1. treating the sacrifice of the Mass as idolatrous, because the Catholics adore there Jesus Christ, as present, after the words of consecration are pronounced. If they were to adore there, or in the Eucharist, mere bread and wine, the charge of idolatry, by this Act of Parliament, would stand good against them; but their adoration is directed to Jesus Christ himself, whom they believe to be there present, in consequence of the words of consecration being pronounced; and all intelligent Protestants, who have acted candidly, have constantly allowed, that those who are persuaded of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, should pay to him in it their adorations. Now, how many Protestants are convinced of the truth of the Real Presence, I don't say Lutherans, but of the Church of England, and this Church's Catechism is strong in its favour, though the end of the definition is tinged with Calvinism: *The Body and Blood are verily and indeed taken*

P

and

and received, but not merely because you *believe* it to be so ; and if you did *not believe* it, there would be no Body and Blood *verily and indeed* : but *your faith* does nothing in the matter ; *the Body and Blood are there verily and indeed*, independently of *your faith* : the * good and the bad, the worthy and the unworthy, equally receive them, but the one to his salvation, and the other to his damnation, *being guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord*, and *not discerning the Lord's Body*. 1 Cor. xi. 27, 29. I could cite also many eminent Divines of the Church of England, who believed that the sacrifice of the Mass is a commemorative sacrifice, though they seem loath to acknowledge it to be likewise propitiatory for the living and the dead, as the Catholics hold it to be. One must think, that the constant application of the merits of Christ's sacrifice on the cross is highly propitiatory ; but let us hear the Bishop of Meaux on this head, who cannot fail giving an intire satisfaction: †

“ In

* Sumunt boni, sumunt mali, forte tamen inequali, vitæ vel interitus. Mors est malis, vita bonis ; vide paris sumptionis, quam sit dispar exitus. Rythm. S. T. Aquin.

† Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church. Sect. XIV.

“ In the consecration, the Body and Blood
 “ are mystically separated, because Jesus Christ
 “ said separately, *This is my Body, This is my*
 “ *Blood*; which includes a lively and effica-
 “ cious representation of the violent death he
 “ suffered.

“ So that the Son of God is placed upon
 “ the holy table, in virtue of these words,
 “ cloathed with those signs which represent
 “ his death: this is effected by consecration;
 “ and this action of Religion carries with it
 “ an acknowledgment of God’s sovereignty;
 “ inasmuch as Jesus Christ, there present, re-
 “ news and perpetuates, in some sort, the re-
 “ membrance of his being obedient, even to
 “ the death of the cross: so that there is no-
 “ thing wanting to render this a true sacrifice.

“ We cannot doubt but this action, as di-
 “ stinct from that of communicating, is of
 “ itself acceptable to God, and makes him
 “ look upon us with a more propitious eye,
 “ because it represents to him that voluntary
 “ death which his beloved Son has suffered for
 “ us sinners; or rather places ~~before~~ before his eyes
 “ that very Son of his, under the signs of this

“ death, by which his wrath had been ap-
“ peased.

“ All Christians will confess the sole pre-
“ sence of Jesus Christ to be a most powerful
“ intercession before God for all mankind, ac-
“ cording to the saying of the Apostle, *That*
“ *Jesus Christ presents himself, and appears for*
“ *us before the face of God.* Heb. xi. 24. So
“ that we believe Jesus Christ, being present
“ upon the holy table, under this figure of
“ death, intercedes for us, and represents con-
“ tinually to his father that death which he
“ has suffered for his Church.

“ It is in this sense we say Jesus Christ of-
“ fers up himself to God for us in the Eucha-
“ rist; it is after this manner we conceive this
“ oblation renders God more propitious to us,
“ and therefore we call this a propitiatory sa-
“ crifice.

“ When we consider what it is Jesus Christ
“ operates in this mystery, and when we see
“ him, by faith, present upon this holy table,
“ together with these signs of death, we unite
“ ourselves to him in this estate; we present
“ him

“ him to God as our only victim, and our sole
 “ propitiator by his Blood ; confessing we have
 “ nothing to offer up to God but Jesus Christ,
 “ and the infinite merit of his death. We
 “ consecrate all our prayers by this holy obla-
 “ tion, and in presenting Jesus Christ to God,
 “ we learn, at the same time, to offer up our-
 “ selves to the divine Majesty, in him and by
 “ him, as living sacrifices.

“ This is the sacrifice of Christians, infi-
 “ nitely different from what was offered up in
 “ the Old Law : a spiritual sacrifice becoming
 “ the New Covenant, in which the presence
 “ of the victim is only perceived by faith ; in
 “ which the word of God is the spiritual sword
 “ which makes a mystical separation betwixt
 “ the Body and Blood ; in which by conse-
 “ quence the blood is only shed mystically,
 “ and in which death only intervenes by re-
 “ presentation ; and yet, however, a real sa-
 “ crifice, in as much as Jesus Christ is there
 “ truly contained and presented to his father,
 “ under this figure of death : but a commemo-
 “ rative sacrifice, which is so far from
 “ taking away our adhesion to the sacrifice of
 “ the cross, as it is objected to us, that, on

“ the contrary, it fixes us the firmer to it,
 “ by all its circumstances ; seeing it has not
 “ only an intire relation to it, but, in reality,
 “ has neither being nor subsistence but by this
 “ relation, from whence it derives all the vir-
 “ tue contained in it.

“ This is the exprefs doctrine of the Catho-
 “ lic Church in the Council of Trent, which
 “ teaches, that this sacrifice is instituted only
 “ *to represent that which was once accomplished*
 “ *upon the cross ; to perpetuate the memory of it*
 “ *to the end of the world ; and to apply to us the*
 “ *saving virtue of it for the remission of those sins*
 “ *which we commit every day. (Sess. 22. cap. 1.)*
 “ So that the Church is so far from believing
 “ that something is wanting to perfect the sa-
 “ crifice of the cross, that, on the contrary,
 “ she thinks it so perfect, and so fully suffi-
 “ cient, as what is added is only instituted to
 “ celebrate the memory and apply its virtue.

“ By which the same Church acknowledges,
 “ that all the merit of the Redemption of
 “ mankind depends upon the death of the Son
 “ of God ; and it ought to be understood,
 “ that when we say to God in the celebration
 “ of

“ of the divine mystery, *We offer thee this holy*
 “ *Host*, we pretend not, by this oblation, to
 “ make or present to God a new payment of
 “ the price of our salvation, but to offer up to
 “ him, in our behalf, the merits of our blessed
 “ JESUS there present, and the infinite price
 “ which he once paid for us upon the cross.”

I ask pardon of the reader for obtruding upon him this long quotation; but as I am no Divine myself, nor have any pretensions that way, I presumed that the Sacrifice of the Mass, the highest and the most solemn act of the Catholic religion, could not be better illustrated than by the pen of so eminent a prelate as M. Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux. And indeed, whoever will give himself the trouble of reading his Exposition, will see the true state of the Catholic Faith, and need not require any other book to give him a proper and adequate idea of it.

I have only a few other things to add, in which Catholics seem to be misrepresented here in England. Dr. Lowth, whose bright genius, great learning, and abilities as a divine, have raised him to the See of Oxford,

is

is pleased to say, with regard to the Catholic
 doctrine of Purgatory, in a Life of William of
 Wykeham, not long since published by him,
 “ That this * persuasion [praying for the
 “ Dead] owed its origin to certain customs,
 “ that prevailed in the early ages of the Church,
 “ innocent perhaps, and blameless in them-
 “ selves, but mistaken at length, and per-
 “ verted from their first intention to much
 “ superstition, both in opinion and practice:
 “ that prayers for the dead seemed at first to
 “ have been used only at their funerals; that
 “ for the greater solemnity, they often chose
 “ to join the service of the interment of the
 “ dead to the celebration of the Eucharist;
 “ ——— that the people began to conclude,
 “ that such services were not merely intended
 “ for a memorial of the deceased, and for their
 “ own edification, but were, in some way,
 “ profitable to those, in whose behalf they
 “ seemed to be made; that these oblations and
 “ sacrifices, though called commemorative,
 “ were easily mistaken for propitiatory; and
 “ the dead were supposed to obtain pardon for
 “ their

* Pages 278, 279, 280.

“ their sins thro’ the intercession of the living;
 “ and that, at last, to account fully for a prac-
 “ tice either ill founded or misunderstood, the
 “ doctrine of Purgatory was invented, or ra-
 “ ther borrowed from the heathen: for, con-
 “ cludes he, it happens in theology, as well
 “ as in natural philosophy, that to give sup-
 “ port and consistency to our own vain ima-
 “ ginations, with regard to some obscure and
 “ mistaken question, we are apt to have re-
 “ course to some new hypothesis equally ima-
 “ ginary and vain.”

Now Dr. Lowth must be very disingenuous,
 or he must confess himself, though a divine,
 quite ignorant of the Catholic doctrine on
 which prayers for the dead, and purgatory are
 grounded. This doctrine is *the temporal pu-
 nishment due to sin*. If he can prove, that no
 such thing as a temporal punishment due to
 sin exists, I will give him up purgatory and
 prayers for the dead; but I think I can pro-
 duce numerous instances from scripture of the
 justice of God requiring such punishment; so
 that I must consider what he has said here as
 idle, imaginary, and bordering on romance.
 Though no direct and positive proof may be
 found

found in the written word of God in support of Purgatory, yet the universal consent of all Christians, for many centuries, is a strong proof that it is an apostolical doctrine. God entirely remits sin by Baptism, without reserving any punishment. By the infinite merit of Christ's sufferings, the eternal punishment due to sin is forgiven, but still there may remain a satisfaction, on the part of the sinner, due to God's justice ; and this satisfaction must be in this world, or in the world to come. Let us not deceive ourselves ; nothing under the stain of any pollution can immediately enter heaven, or be admitted to immediate happiness. The scripture mentions, that there are some sins which shall neither be forgiven in this world nor in the world to come ; therefore there is a forgiveness of some sins in the other world, or satisfaction to be made by the sinner ; and reason tells us, that some temporal pain should be exacted of us to retain us in our duty ; and Catholics are as sensible as Protestants, that their Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ has fully satisfied for them, and they hereby do not in the least pretend to extenuate any thing of the infinite value of his merits.

But

But I shall beg leave once more to quote the Bishop of Meaux. “ Those, † says he, who
 “ depart this life in grace and charity, but
 “ nevertheless indebted to the divine justice for
 “ some pains which it reserved, are to suffer
 “ them in the other life. This is what obliged
 “ all the primitive Christians to offer up pray-
 “ ers, alms-deeds, and sacrifices, for the faith-
 “ ful who departed in peace, and in the com-
 “ munion of the Church, with an assured
 “ faith that they could be assisted by these
 “ means. This is what the Council of Trent
 “ proposes to our belief, touching the souls
 “ detained in purgatory, without determining
 “ in what their pains consist, or many other
 “ such like things; concerning which this
 “ holy council demands great moderation,
 “ blaming those who divulge what is uncer-
 “ tain or suspected.

“ The very consideration of what we call
 “ *satisfaction*, being nothing but the applica-
 “ tion of the infinite *satisfaction* of JESUS
 “ CHRIST, ought to appease those who are
 “ offended

† Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church.
 Sect. VIII.

“ offended when we tell them, that God is so
 “ well pleased with fraternal charity, and the
 “ communion of saints, that he frequently al-
 “ so accepts of those satisfactions which we
 “ offer up one for another. Certainly those
 “ who have read and considered how God him-
 “ self inspires his servants with a desire to af-
 “ flict themselves with fasting, hair-cloth and
 “ ashes, not only for their own sins, but also
 “ for the sins of all the people, will not be
 “ astonished if we say, that being touched
 “ with the delight he has to gratify his friends,
 “ he mercifully accepts of the humble sacrifice
 “ of their voluntary mortifications, in abate-
 “ ment of those chastisements he prepared for
 “ his people; which shews, that being satisf-
 “ fied by these he renders himself more mild
 “ towards the others; by this means honour-
 “ ing his son JESUS CHRIST in the commu-
 “ nion of his members, and in the holy society
 “ of his mystical body.”

The doctrine of *Indulgences* is connected
 with that of purgatory. *Indulgence* is not a
 leave to commit sin, nor yet a pardon for sin,
 but only a relaxing of some part of the tempo-
 ral punishment due to sin. The necessity of
 satisfactory

satisfactory works, as we have seen above, caused the primitive Church to impose upon sinners those pains, called canonical; which, when they performed with humility, the Church having a regard to their fervour and sincerity, mitigated some part of them. No Protestant, of the Church of England, can deny the power of *binding and loosing* in the Church, and the Council of Trent proposes nothing else to be believed concerning Indulgences, but that *the power to grant them has been given to the Church by Jesus Christ, and that the use of them is beneficial to salvation*; to which this Council adds, *that this power ought to be retained, yet used with moderation, lest ecclesiastical discipline should be weakened by an over-great facility*. Whence it appears, that the Church is not so tenacious of retaining the use of Indulgences, but that she may at any time set them aside.

The same Act of the Parliament of England, above referred to, that treats the Sacrifice of the Mass as superstitious and idolatrous, passes the like censure on the *invocation*, or *adoration* of the Virgin Mary, or any other Saint. The Catholics, in consequence of an Article

Q

of

of their Creed, called *the Communion of Saints*, invoke, 'tis true, the saints and friends of God, that reign with him in his glory, to intercede and pray for them; but it is a vile calumny to say, that they therefore *adore*, or *worship* the saints. They only beg their prayers, as we do in this life the prayers of one another, and if I desire *John* to pray for me, this does not argue that I pray to *John*, or render him by such desire any worship. The prayer of the Just is, no doubt, acceptable to God, and God will have regard to it. The Catholics all know that the Saints are very happy in heaven, and that their happiness is the effect of the mercies of God, who, in rewarding their merits, has crowned only his own gifts in them; none can therefore presume that they require any worship, or would have any thing derogated from the honour due to God alone, by praise, thanksgiving, and adoration. But, says the Protestant, there is no occasion to invoke the saints for their prayers or intercession, as they do not hear you. How does the Protestant know but that the saints enjoy the sight of the beatific vision? It is very probable they do; and if so, they hear our prayers. The Church, however, has decided

cided nothing in the matter, leaving it to conjecture, whether the saints have a knowledge of our necessities by the communication of angels, who, according to scripture, know, as God's administering spirits, what passes in this world, or whether God himself makes them acquainted with our desires by a particular revelation; or whether lastly, he discovers these desires to them in his divine essence, in which all truth is comprehended.

There is nothing more material in any other point of faith or doctrine, that deserves being discussed; for, as to points of mere discipline, they may be considered as in a fluctuating condition; new regulations may arise, and the old ones may be abolished, as the Church thinks fit, without any detriment to her faith. So that, from all that has been said in this chapter, I conclude with a thought of the Chevalier Ramsay, "it was thus, says he, that the " Archbishop [Fenelon of Cambrai] convinced " me, that a sober thinking Deist, must of " necessity become a Christian, and that a " Christian cannot reason philosophically without becoming a Catholic."

New

Now, gentlemen Protestants, what is your opinion of the Catholics? Can their principles of faith or morality be prejudicial to the welfare of any state? Still if their religion offends you, and you have an unconquerable aversion against it, throw a veil over it, and keep it hidden from your eyes. But do not reject them as countrymen, fellow-citizens, and brethren. Civil Society calls upon you to do them, as such, all the good offices in your power; the common right of Subjects intitles them to your benevolence, and humanity dictates, that you should no longer think of oppressing them. They offer their sincere allegiance to his Majesty King GEORGE, and his PARLIAMENT, and they have reason to flatter themselves, from the constant endeavours of the paternal care and tenderness of his Majesty to promote the happiness of his people, that they among the rest, will be again adopted into the condition of his dutiful children. In such dispositions, and with the warmest wishes for the prosperity of his Majesty and his Government, they hope their humble petition will not be rejected.

F I N I S.

JUSTIFICATIVE

P I E C E.

SINCE the first appearance of this Apology for the Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland, it has laboured under a variety of discouragements, which, though it may not be so necessary for the Public to be made acquainted with, yet it will be always advisable not to keep them in ignorance concerning any hidden spring, or principle, supposed to influence the working of the machine. For, whether the motion of the machine be accelerated or retarded, the causes must require some investigation; and on that account, it cannot seem improper to inform the Public of them, with an appeal to their decision of the attention that

R

should

should be paid to them, or the light they deserve to be considered in. A diversity, however, of opinion may even then arise, some approving, others disapproving the Appellant's measures, just as their minds are biased by prejudice or passion: but suppose opinion unites to discredit, not to favour him, still the Appellant, looking back at the rectitude of his intention, by stepping forth to defend the cause of justice and truth, will have reason to console himself for all the obloquy and disgrace he suffers from whimsical fancy or strange caprice; and examining into his candour, he will pride himself that he can view it as an entrenchment which the boldest assailant may not be able to force. Such is his armour, such are his weapons; and though not in the least diffident of the repelling force they are endued with; yet, as to himself, he freely acknowledges that he is subject to mistakes and oversights, blemishes incident to human nature; but having no fondness for them, he is ready to retract, the moment he sees himself, or is advised by others, that he has made the least deviation from truth. In this disposition therefore, he can the better obviate the embarrassments he has been entangled in.

First

First, he has been apprized that several of the Catholic nobility of this realm have expressed great displeasure that an obscure author should presume to make an apology for them, being fully sufficient themselves, if they found it needful, to petition in a body his Majesty and his Parliament, for a mitigation of grievances. The Author does not in the least question their sufficiency, and he believes that it promises fair to carry great weight with it. The united suffrages of many respectable hereditary members of the King's Great Council, must be thought to be a powerful intercession. But why should not an address of the kind be found needful, especially as the affairs of the Catholics now seem to stand at their crisis, both in Great Britain and Ireland? In the latter country particularly, the Catholics, harassed above measure, as if reputed unworthy of the life they breathe, have been at last taught, from a long course of misery, to unlearn their infatuation of loyalty to immediate hereditary and indefeasible right: for that man must certainly be a fool, who should run the risque of forfeiting his life, his fortune, his tranquillity, his pretensions to the conveniences and natural privileges of well-being in

this world, and all for the sake of maintaining the validity or legality of a title, in direct opposition to the established laws of the land.— Still some may think it a point of honour, and may even glory in the thought; but in the main, what is it? An airy bubble, an embryo of fancy, a fond conceit, a strange illusion, an absurdity both in speculation and practice, and as such discountenanced by Reason, discarded by Conscience, and rejected by Religion. *Rex eris si recte facias*, is a law written on the human heart, and Reason, Conscience, and Religion, tell us that it is written in indelible characters, though Power usurped, and the arbitrary frowns of tyrants strive to obliterate them. Here is then the line of perfection for every good government, and the sum of the original contract entered into between King and People. The English nation seeing admired it, admiring loved it, and loving adopted it. A few, it is true, of the members of her body-politic were not immediately sensible of so many engaging charms, but so soon as they discovered the narrowness of their conceptions, they shewed themselves ready and willing to enlarge them to the just proportion of the standard. The author here principally
 hints

hints at the disposition of the Irish Catholics for approving themselves good and unexceptionable subjects, being well assured that it is the universal sense of the clergy, as well as laity, of all ranks and denominations amongst them, to ascertain, by a test, their fidelity to the Government, and manifest their attachment to the Protestant succession, in the illustrious house of Hanover. And indeed, of this disposition of the Irish Catholics for meriting the attention of the Government, there have been so many, and such strong convincing proofs, that a right rev. Bishop of England has, not long since, drawn up and transmitted to them the form of their oath of Allegiance; in consequence of which, as supposing it to have the sanction of authority, they have prayed in all their places of worship, for the temporal and eternal prosperity of all the Royal Family; an instance of loyalty which they had before shewn reluctant minds against, and had never practised since the Revolution. But, says the Protestant (who would abate nothing in the rigour of the penal laws against the Catholics), why did they not long ago declare their submission to the Government? They could not be ignorant of the provisions made by Parlia-

ment in the Act of Succession, for securing the imperial crown of these realms to Protestants, and to them only. And now, since they have seen the hopes of a popish Pretender intirely extinguished; since France and Spain have ceased to flatter them with ideas of conquest over the Protestants, they begin in a desponding mood to cry out *Peccavimus*.---A difference in religious tenets being not a sufficient plea, this may seem to be the full stress of all the arguments an English Protestant can have recourse to for obstructing the Government's granting terms to the Catholics, if they were inclined to it: but these arguments are only skimmed over with a specious gloss, and what will be their significancy when stripped of it? If we but for a moment consider the political state of the nation at the time of the Revolution, we shall have all the difficulty in the world to draw a line between loyalty on one side, and rebellion on the other. It is success only that has set on either its distinguishing mark. — Even then when it was decided that King James II. had abdicated the Government, and the Throne was declared vacant, the people of England shewed little fondness to make the Prince of Orange their King. Most of the Protestants

'tis

'tis true, confessed him to be their deliverer from all the perils of popery and slavery ; but though he was seconded by partizans, potent and numerous, though he had an army at command, to awe into compliance, yet a majority by one vote only invested him with royalty. Now, when the sense of a whole nation is far from being unanimous, even by the medium of Representatives whom they have delegated to chuse for them, though a single vote carries the point in debate, the dissenting party cannot therefore be properly treated as disobedient or rebellious. There must be time left for reflection. The expediency of the measure may require to be cautiously weighed before its just and intrinsic value can be ascertained ; and when it is, prejudice may condescend at last to entertain more favourable sentiments on the prospect of better and greater emoluments. The observation on the difficulty of procuring and establishing the royalty of the Prince of Orange, holds good in regard to the house of Hanover. The case is exactly of a similar nature on both sides, and presents to view the same aspect. Disaffection, assassination-plots, and rebellion threatned to shake the foundation of their thrones, and the Protest-

ant was as deeply engaged, if not more so, than the Catholic, in the enterprize. But the generality of Protestants saw, perhaps, sooner the destructive tendency of such schemes. The liberty and property of the subject were better secured by the stipulated conditions of the Revolution than ever they were before ; and it being the design by it to fix them firmly, and as it were, on an eternal basis, they perceived clearly that it was infinitely more eligible to be governed by a King, who voluntarily subjected himself to the laws of the land, and who resolved to govern by them as their executor only ; than to a King, who by a divine right placed himself above the laws, and fancied he could dispense with them on any emergency, as absolute master over them. If nothing else, considering the right of the Parliament to dispose of and alter the succession of the crown, could justify the Revolution, this very reflection would, and that in so ample a manner, that no rational reply can be made to it. This being the state of the case, as it is in fact, I shall safely venture to draw this inference from it : that the Catholics had been long inclined to make an entire submission to the Government, but that the Government would

would not accept of it. They were frequently represented to his late Majesty, King George II. as a set of People whom no oaths could bind, and therefore not to be trusted. His Majesty is said to be of opinion, that it was a salutary measure, if it could be effected by any proper means, to make them good subjects; that his subjects in his German dominions of that Religion, were as good and as loyal as any he had there; that keeping them at a distance, only irritated them the more, and made them ripe for rebellion, whenever an opportunity offered; and that harsh treating of them, and setting them at defiance, as declared enemies, even when they could not rebel, put them upon annoying the state in other shapes, by consulting the interest of the Catholic Powers, and serving in their armies. The late Duke of Cumberland is reported to be of the same opinion with his royal father in the last particular, alluding, perhaps, to some ill effects of resentment he had met with from the Scots and Irish in his foreign campaigns. It cannot be seen what plausible reasons there were for over-ruling his late Majesty's opinion; if such in reality, as we cannot help thinking it was, from his paternal care to gain the af-

fections of all his subjects, by the lenity and mildness of his government, of which the Catholics, notwithstanding the rigours of their situation, were never more sensible since the Revolution. A fair tryal might, at least, for a limited time, have been made of their loyalty, and as it was not, when Majesty itself was pleased to desire it, one should be apt to presume, that some latent enmity, not so much to the Catholics, as to the solid and permanent felicity of the house of Hanover, forbade it; for indeed the flower may appear gay and alluring, but it is often fraught with poison. That the Catholics may be trusted, may have no other interest to serve but that of their country, may be constant and firm in their allegiance to the Protestant succession in the house of Hanover, is a matter that will admit of no doubt, especially as the most sacred ties of religion and conscience bind them to it, in as great a degree, if not greater, than any other set of people in the nation. Nothing is more idle than to think otherwise, and of this sufficient evidences may be seen in several passages of the foregoing Apology. It must be therefore very unreasonable to reproach them with entertaining expectancies of better hap,

from

from the restoration of a popish Pretender. For such an atchievement an armed force must be had and kept, superior to the contingencies of all present and future opposition. Human probabilities, considering the temper of the English, make void any notion of the kind. A supple slave, though there may be a sycophant, is next to an impossibility in England. Suppose, however, this popish Pretender should be received upon conditions. Could he then be a Moses to the Catholics, to deliver them out of the house of bondage; or a Joshua, to lead them into the land of promise? No: the same laws subsisting against them, he must depend on the complaisance of his Parliament for a mitigation or repeal of them; and if the Parliament could not be induced to this complaisant humour, and he still openly or occultly favoured the Catholics, we should then see revive all the fears and jealousies, all the plots and counter-plots, all the deceit and perjury, all the innocent blood shed, all the imprisonments, confiscations and penalties, the reign of Charles II. was so signal for. In the name of God, it is far better, if on no other account than the sake of more peace and quietness, for the Catholics to live as they are, in a
state

state of oppression, than to flatter themselves with a prospect of relief from the restoration of the house of Stuart. They scarce could find redress in such an event, but by absolute and arbitrary power, a thing impracticable, and which they themselves, having a tender regard to the constitutional liberties of their country, would be amongst the last to desire. How numerous have been the ills, how heavy the calamities they have suffered from their blind attachment to the fortunes of James II. ! The Irish in a more grievous manner than their other distressed brethren, feel the dismal effects of it, and to this day the gloominess created by it, hangs lowering on the brow of the broken remains of some of their best families. But what is here inculcated is not with the view to cast the least odium upon the house of Stuart. The name deserves to be revered, were it for no other reason than its mingling with the blood of the most illustrious potentates in Europe. Others may repute it a point of merit to ingratiate themselves by the foulest abuse of its memory ; but the artifice, base and illiberal as it is, forces contempt from the ingenuous mind, and whilst we adore the unsearchable designs of Providence, in giving and

taking

taking away kingdoms ; as men, we should always drop a tear of pity on the misfortunes and frailties of our nature. Whence the intention of the Author has been all along plain and obvious, being calculated to demonstrate, that upon an unprejudiced review of all circumstances, it is much more advisable for the Catholics to covet subjection to the house of Hanover, as by law established, even in a state of persecution, than to the house of Stuart ; and much more conducive to their happiness, if the burdens that weigh them down were in some measure alleviated. Of this all the Catholics, whether British or Irish, seem now conscious to themselves, not because their hopes of a popish Pretender are extinguished, but because they clearly see the tranquility of undisturbed life connected with it. For indeed, if any are so fanciful as to foster the hopes of a Pretender, they may still do it as much as ever. It appears by M'Allester's letters, not long since published, that the Pretender, though apparently disavowed by France, was the animating spring last war of all their secret schemes against England. Hope, therefore, how vain soever, is the last smiling solace that quits a man before he resigns his breath. As a balsam

to

to his woes, he will figure to himself that the hand, which was the cause of his being depressed, might again be instrumental towards lifting him up ; so that a Pretender will never be wanting to those who chuse to create one, though every one of the house of Stuart was as extinct in life, as in law, to the people of Great Britain and Ireland. But as human prudence should be supposed to influence mens actions, so as not to permit them to relinquish the substance for the shadow ; and as our age have got into the philosophizing strain of leaving as little as possible to the caprices of fortune ; the Catholics will likewise do very wisely in acting up to the same character. The same political route should be naturally open for them to steer in as well as others, especially since all faction has subsided, all odious party distinctions are abolished, and all hearts are now united in sincere affection for his present Majesty, whose auspicious reign for moderation, beneficence, and all other princely virtues, will ever stand conspicuous in our Annals : -

Pacatumque reget patrius virtutibus orbem.

Those cursory remarks the Author thought it not amiss to throw together, for the serious perusal

refusal of those who were offended at his presumption in undertaking to be their Apologist. He grants it may be a fault without their participation; but his obscurity incapacitating him from any connections with the Great, and his party having suffered greatly, and being likely to suffer more from scandal, calumny, and vile misrepresentation, he fancied his offering something in their defence would not be altogether unacceptable to the moderate and sober-thinking. Abler pens could have acquitted themselves in a masterly manner, with more elegance, and a more nervous diction than he has done; but nothing having occurred to him except a few negative answers, of little moment, in the News-papers, which languished and died away with the day, and delays being dangerous, the task fell to his share, which he entered upon without any expectation of fee or reward from his party, and at last completed, defraying all the expences himself, out of what he could spare from a scanty and dependent income. However, as the Great and Noble may be ashamed of, or not have a relish for any thing that is not of a kindred nature to themselves, or at least is not in some sense a *magni nominis umbra*; the Author takes this

oppor-

opportunity to inform them, that though obscure, and not having now a foot of land remaining to him, out of all the possessions of his forefathers; he is of an ancient Equestrian family, formerly of some renown in England, the co-heiress of the progenitor he directly derives from, having brought in marriage the manor of Bletfho, to Roger Lord Beauchamp of Bletfho, from whose issue descended Margaret, sole remaining heir of this family, first married to Sir Oliver St. John (of whom the Lords St. John of Bletfho are descended, as also the Viscounts' St. John) and afterwards to John Beaufort, Duke of Somerset, whose issue Margaret by this last marriage, married to Edmund of Hadham, Earl of Richmond, and by him was mother to King Henry VII. The Author is besides a gentleman by education, having been regularly brought up in a University.

In the second place, the Author is said not to be explicit enough in defining the King's title. The idea he has formed of it may not, perhaps, be intirely flattering, but in the main, it is not less true. The grand fundamental maxim upon which the *jus coronæ*, or right of suc-

fucceffion to the throne of thefe kingdoms, depends, is, according to Dr. Blackftone and our beft lawyers, this ; “ that the crown is, by
 “ common law, and constitutional cuftom,
 “ hereditary ; and this in a manner peculiar
 “ to itfelf : but that the right of inheritance
 “ may from time to time be changed or limited by act of Parliament ; under which
 “ limitations the crown ftill continues hereditary.” By the Parliament’s interfering in changing or limiting the right of fucceffion to the throne fince the refignation of Richard II. many were of opinion that fince that time the crown was elective, or held by parliamentary right. This opinion particularly prevailed among the Paritans and Regicides, at the unparalleled trial of the unfortunate Charles I. though the king himfelf and his partizans contended for a *divine right*, which was alledged to be intimately and neceffarily connected with his *hereditary right*. For James I. his father, uniting in his perfon every poffible claim by hereditary right, for more than eight hundred years, to the Englifh as well as Scottifh throne, being the heir both of Egbert and William the conqueror, it is no wonder, that he, a prince of more learning than wifdom, was eafily taught

taught by the flatterers of the times to believe there was something divine in his right, and that the finger of providence was visible in its preservation. The opinion of the Crown held by *Parliamentary Right*, was afterwards embraced and maintained by all the *Dissenters*, and the party denominated *Whigs*. From what was transacted in regard to the famous bill of exclusion, which raised such a ferment in the latter end of the reign of Charles II. we may collect two things: first, that the crown was almost universally acknowledged to be hereditary, and the inheritance indefeasible, unless by Parliament; else it had been needless to prefer such a bill. Secondly, that the Parliament had a power to have defeated the inheritance: else such a bill had been ineffectual. The Commons acknowledged the hereditary right then subsisting; and the Lords did not dispute the power, but merely the propriety of an exclusion. A full parliamentary Convention, representing the whole society, having next examined into the reasons, and other concurring circumstances, that brought on the Revolution in 1688, decreed that James II. had abdicated the Government, and that the throne was thereby vacant. Thus ended at once

once, by this sudden and unexpected vacancy of the throne, the old line of succession, which from the conquest had lasted above 600 years, and from the union of the Heptarchy in King Egbert almost 900. There was an absolute defeasance of the crown to the Stuart family, and they were supposed extinct in law. Upon these principles the Convention might, if they pleased, have vested the royal dignity in a family intirely new, and strangers to the royal blood; but they chose to depart no further from the ancient line, than temporary necessity and self-preservation required. The subsequent princes, however, did not take the crown by *hereditary right* or *descent*, but by way of *donation* or *purchase*, as the Lawyers call it; by which they mean any method of acquiring an estate otherwise than by descent. But this definition seems frivolous, and out of the road of common sense: so that the right must be properly, *elective by parliament*, though in general hereditary, or descendible to the next heir, on the death or demise of the last proprietor. Therefore, all the several actual limitations, from the time of Henry IV. to the present, do clearly prove the power of the King and Parliament to new-model or alter
the

the succession, and it has been made highly penal to dispute it, by statute 6 Ann. c. 7.

In the third place, the Author thinks it necessary to observe, that he has been guilty of an error in saying, page 150 of the *Apology*, that “two of the sacraments were instituted by Christ himself, viz. Baptism and the Eucharist, and the rest by the Apostles, according to Christ’s particular instructions.” The Catholic Church holds that all the sacraments are equally of divine institution; for all the power of the Apostles, and all the power derived to the Church from them, would be insufficient for the instituting of a sacrament, without a very particular commission from Christ himself. So that by saying, “the rest were instituted by the Apostles, according to Christ’s particular instructions,” the Author was wrong in not adding Penance to Baptism and the Eucharist, as immediately instituted by Christ himself; for we find the institution of the sacrament of Penance, set forth by very express words in this text of scripture: *And when he said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose*

whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained. John, xx. 22, 23. The Church of England in her liturgy acknowledges this divine institution, where she says, "And who hath given
 " power to his ministers to absolve all those
 " who truly repent, and unfeignedly believe
 " his holy Gospel." Absolution pre-supposes Contrition or Repentance, and Confession, both which the Church of England grants as right; but she recommends only Confession, without making it obligatory, and is silent in regard to Satisfaction, another part of the sacrament of Penance, which is equally necessary for christian perfection.

Lastly, the Author presumes it is not improper to apprise all those who are not willing to make use of their own judgments, but have recourse to the Reviews, as infallible standards and guides in criticism, for the characters of books, that he is charged by the Critical Review of wanting historical evidence to corroborate the facts and doctrines he has advanced in regard to the Albigenes. The cloud of historical witnesses quoted at the close of that account, is sufficient to refute the inanity of this Critic's assertion; and as if he had effected
 mighty

mighty matters, he would fain make the Author appear ridiculous by a

risum teneatis amici?

whereas the laugh is against himself, in having made a rod for his own back. The Author is pretty confident that all the facts he has advanced are well supported and authenticated, and in this respect he doubts not of his being able to confront any critic in England. As to what the Critic says, that his Apology is rather virulent, and a sort of insult upon a Protestant nation, it may perhaps be considered so in his eye, and in that of all those, who are uneasy at hearing the words of truth, or cannot bear its light: for it is a saying, “that he who follows truth too close at the heels, shall have dirt thrown in his face.” The Author was far from intending the least insult to the nation as Protestant, but considering it as his country, and as a land of liberty, where the meanest subject has a right to defend himself, to expostulate for injuries done him, and to complain of grievance and oppression, the tone of an abject suppliant must, in such circumstances, be quite beneath the dignity of the free-born.

Neither

Neither was it decent for him to betray fear, or any base symptom of servility.

Degeneres animos timor arguit.

So that if any acrimony or severity in reflection has appeared, it must be attributed not to any hatred of the Author's antagonists, as men and brethren, but to a spark of resentment for their illiberal usage, and this is the cause assigned by him in his Preface.

